

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o CI. OCTOBER 1900.

ART. I.—RECENT NEW TESTAMENT
COMMENTARIES.

1. *The Expositor's Greek Testament.* Edited by the Rev. W. R. NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. Volume II. 'The Acts of the Apostles.' By the Rev. R. J. KNOWLING, D.D. 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.' By the Rev. JAMES DENNEY, D.D. 'St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.' By the Rev. G. G. FINDLAY, B.A. (London, 1900.)
2. *International Handbooks to the New Testament.* Edited by ORELLO CONE, D.D. To be completed in four volumes. Volume I. 'The Synoptic Gospels, together with a chapter on the text-criticism of the New Testament.' By GEORGE LOVELL CARY, A.M., L.H.D. Volume II. 'The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, and Philippians.' By JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D. (New York and London, 1899.)

THE primary purpose of a Review is to review, and it has been sometimes felt, even by those who have given us most welcome and generous encouragement, that the *Church Quarterly Review* has set itself too rigidly to the accomplishment of this primary purpose, so that articles of a more permanent character have been exceptional in its list. This charge, if it be a charge, or, as we prefer to say, this friendly suggestion, deserves our best attention, from the evident sincerity out of which it springs. From the nature of the case we must always, in the majority of our articles, lay

VOL. LI.—NO. CI.

B

370654

ourselves open to it, for from the beginning we have always prefixed to them the titles of one or more books. But we fully recognize that it is desirable to base our criticism of books upon the deep principles of the Catholic Faith, and to put our detailed remarks into such a form that our readers may clearly see their relation to the central verities of the Christian religion, and obtain a firmer hold upon the truth.

The books which are now before us afford a specially suitable illustration of the point with which we are concerned. At first sight a parcel of new commentaries is only likely to lead to 'a review of books,' in the course of which a description may be given of the general character of the commentary, and the value of the work may be tested by an examination of a sufficient number of crucial passages. Obviously, as much as this is due to the writers who have spent upon their books the large amount of labour which the compilation of a commentary involves. But if this duty of criticism is faithfully performed, it is plain that we find ourselves unavoidably in the presence of great principles of revelation, which are of permanent and tremendous importance. The mixture of truth and error which is contained in the familiar saying that the Bible is to be treated like any other book; the extraordinary power of self-deception in the human heart which is manifest in the popular belief that it is possible to approach the study of the Bible without dogmatic prepossessions; the loss of time, not to say the defiance of the majesty of truth, which is involved in the foolish process of beginning the study of the sacred text all over again as if no truth were yet known, and the Catholic Church had not been guided by the Holy Spirit into all the truth in the course of nineteen centuries; the inclination of commentators to stay in the porch of sacred study, as if grammar, and variations in the text, and supposed or actual discrepancies in parallel parts of the sacred narrative, and the knowledge of the different interpretations of many commentators were the be-all and the end-all of a commentary; the readiness to abandon any definite conclusion, from a mawkish dread of narrowness, which is likely to offend one of the innumerable sects of professing Christians, all of which claim, and are supposed in the fashion of the day to have, an equal right in the lively oracles of God;—all these and many similar matters must frequently be suggested by the details of a modern commentary, and they are matters which are undeniably 'in very close contact with all-important issues. We cannot form a proper estimate of their value, and of the

book
look
my
Kin
the
duti
com
tion
in c
gifts
We
of th
whic
cent

Nic
noti
the
and
Rom
than
gives
of co
to th
140
intro
200
the
more
the v
our
volun

I
Test
which
of th
Gosp
lonia
been
mon
we p
from
Inter

books which suggest such reflections to us, without once more looking into the depths of Revelation, the existence of God, the mystery of His being, the Incarnation, the Sacrifice, and the Kingdom of His Only Son, the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, the fall and the recovery of man, his origin and his destiny, his duties and his responsibilities. After all, the real value of a commentary upon God's revealed Word depends upon the relation in which it stands towards the things which are not seen, in comparison of which all else is as nothing, though all the gifts of modern scholarship may be consecrated to their service. We shall not forget, as we examine the many excellent points of these volumes, and survey the greatly varying materials of which they are composed, that 'What think ye of Christ?' is the central test which must be applied to them in the last resort.

We have already described the general purpose of Dr. Nicoll's edition of *The Expositor's Greek Testament* in our notice of the first volume. On the whole we consider that the second volume, which contains nearly a thousand pages, and treats of the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle to the Romans, and the first Epistle to the Corinthians, is better than the first. On the Acts of the Apostles Dr. Knowling gives forty-eight pages of introduction and about 500 pages of comment. Professor Denney's introduction to the Epistle to the Romans occupies about thirty pages, and his comments 140 pages. Professor Findlay devotes twenty-six pages of introduction to the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and about 200 pages to his comments. It will be seen, therefore, that the treatment of the Acts of the Apostles occupies rather more than half of the volume. Our opinion of the value of the work will be more suitably expressed when we have made our remarks upon detailed passages. In form the second volume maintains the excellence of the first.

Dr. Cone's edition of *International Handbooks to the New Testament* is to be completed in four volumes, the first two of which are now before us. In the first volume President Cary, of the Meadville Theological School, undertakes the Synoptic Gospels, and in the second volume the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, and Philippians have been entrusted to an eminent Unitarian, Dr. James Drummond, the principal of Manchester College at Oxford. As we proceed we shall see, not for the first time, what 'freedom from dogmatic prepossessions' is supposed to mean. The *International Handbooks* constitute an exegetical series

which is designed to cover the whole of the New Testament, and is constructed on a plan of running sections, which admit of greater freedom of treatment than is usual, or indeed possible, in commentaries proper. A greater prominence is given to passages of doctrinal and practical importance than to the minute examination of minor grammatical points. The introductory parts which deal with authorship and date have been carefully prepared, and there are numerous dissertations upon matters of graver import. The writers urge upon us that their aim has been to treat the books of the New Testament 'as a literature which in order to be understood must be explained, like all other ancient literatures, in accordance with the accepted principles of the grammatical and historical interpretation,' and to apply this method as if they had no bias at all towards any part of dogmatic theology. Their purpose is to furnish a series of Handbooks to the general reader which shall present to him the results of the latest scholarship and of the most thorough critical investigation. By giving more prominence to the results of critical processes than to discussions of grammar, philology, and exegesis, the writers believe that they have provided more suitable materials for busy students, preachers, and teachers. The text of the Revised Version has been used, though, for the sake of space, it has not been printed at length.

In applying this general design to the Synoptic Gospels, Mr. Cary, following largely the arrangement of Holtzmann and Huck, has distributed the materials of the Gospels into 202 sections. Before this sectional commentary he has placed a select bibliography, an introduction which deals with the New Testament as literature, with the special points for notice in regard to each Gospel as a whole, with the Synoptic problem, and with the difficult but fruitful work of the construction of synopses and harmonies. The distribution of the 202 sections will indicate in a general way what is the plan of treatment. Thirteen sections are devoted to the birth and childhood of our Lord, ninety to the Galilean ministry, thirty-two to the incidents of various journeyings, twenty-three to the events which occurred at Jerusalem before Holy Week, fourteen to the eschatological discourse, twenty-five to 'the Passion'—which should have been entitled 'the Passion and the Resurrection' or 'the Exodus'—and the remaining five sections to the post-resurrection events. These sections are followed by the chapter in which Mr. Cary deals with the 'elements of text-criticism' under the headings of various readings, codices, versions, patristic quotations, the laws of text-criticism, and

som
Mr.
Old
the
poss
cross
inde
pass
haus
emb
Dr.
com
less
to e
each
plan
part
ever
smal
with
popu
the
neces

Cary
Bibl
to m
his a
shou
wha
mea
hona
mea
judg
tion
we
wher
is pe
our
we e
not,
belie
reco
lowe
belie

some editions of the Greek New Testament. In the appendix Mr. Cary discusses the Messianic hope, quotations from the Old Testament, the Herod family, the Scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes, the synagogue, demoniacal possession, the term 'Son of Man,' the Talmud, parables, the cross and crucifixion, and miracles. A carefully-compiled text-index enables the reader at once to find the comment on any passage required. As the Gospels themselves are an inexhaustible treasury for commentators, so the Epistles still embarrass their students by the richness of their contents, and Dr. Drummond has had no easy task in compressing his comments upon seven of St. Paul's Epistles into a volume of less than 400 pages. He has written a short introduction to each Epistle, and prefixed an analysis of its contents in each case to the commentary which follows. The general plan of the series has forced Dr. Drummond for the most part to avoid the use of Greek, and the bulk of his material, even in the more technical discussions which are printed in small type, can be understood by those who are acquainted with English alone. In our detailed remarks we shall follow the popular order, and take first the Gospels and then the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, making such references as are necessary to the three volumes before us indiscriminately.

In approaching the study of the Synoptic Gospels, Mr. Cary re-echoes the popular opinion that 'the student of the Bible, just as much as the student of Shakespeare, is bound to maintain always an altogether impartial attitude towards his author,' and that 'dogmatism has here no place, and it should be altogether immaterial to the critic, as a critic, at what conclusions he shall in any case arrive' (p. xx). If this means that all evidence must be fairly faced, and the truth honestly sought, we have nothing to say against it; but if it means that the critic is not to doubt the soundness of his own judgment when his conclusions place him in apparent opposition to the Creeds of his spiritual and divinely guided Mother, we can only say that the critical faculty is a dangerous gift when it is isolated from other endowments of man, and that it is perilous to put asunder what God has joined together. For our part, by no amount of effort of critical detachment could we ever treat the Bible like Shakespeare. To us the Bible is not, and never can be, like any other book; for after all we believe that it is handed to us by the Church as the inspired record of a supernatural entrance of heavenly forces into this lower world, and to act as if we believed what we do not believe is not to be loyal to the supreme claims of truth.

Mr. Cary only has room for a concise statement of leading views of the 'Synoptic problem' at the present time, and cannot say more than that the dominant opinion just now appears to be that the chronological order of the Synoptists is St. Mark, St. Matthew, St. Luke. This undogmatic commentator, we observe, acts throughout upon the dogma that the epithet of Saint shall not be used when any Evangelist is mentioned. After saying that it was thought that our Lord, if He were the Christ, must needs be able to trace His (or, as Mr. Cary says, 'his') descent from David, our author curiously observes that our Lord Himself did not think so seems to be implied in the searching question 'If David then calls Him (the Christ) Lord, how is He his Son?' This remark, made clearer by the comment on the passage in a later section, misses, in our opinion, the whole drift of the question, which is not designed to show that David did not think of our Lord as his Son, but that our Lord was David's Lord and Son because He was, first of all and eternally the Son of God, and then, without ceasing at the root of His being to be what He had ever been, became the Son of Mary (pp. 2,266). While we are on this point we may notice that Mr. Cary says that 'the fact that modern scholarship affirms the non-Davidic authorship of Psalm cx. makes it necessary to hold, in opposition to the prevailing theory of the Christian Church, that Jesus had no other standard of judgment with regard to the Old Testament Scriptures than the current opinion of his time,' and also that He shared 'the opinion of his contemporaries that Psalm cx. is of a Messianic character, a view receiving no support from modern Biblical criticism.' Here is the dogma that it is necessary to give up any belief about our Lord, even if it has formed a part of the Church's faith hitherto, when it does not agree with the affirmation—Mr. Cary does not say the proof—of modern scholarship. The treatment of this passage leads us to turn to the comments on our Lord's Virgin birth, and with these we have to express our immense dissatisfaction. We are glad that Mr. Cary is able to recognize that it is unquestionably the intention of the writer to represent our Lord 'as having been born through the immediate influence of the Divine Spirit while' His 'mother was still a virgin,' but we cannot agree with him when he goes on to say that this 'plainly makes the preceding genealogy altogether irrelevant to the purpose for which it was introduced.' We prefer to think that Mr. Cary's remarks plainly show that he himself is labouring under some mistake about the actual

purpo
seem
Hebr
a vir
restr
us in
child
kind,
prop
the u
passa
stand
many
bette
prop
He '
reason
in th
witho
doub
whic
that
of m
for u
Lord
paren
claim
dogm
Gosp
by be
ancie
ming
Mr.
not
cases
are t
and
and
of ou
that
to sa
C
men
Bap
narr

purpose of the introduction of the genealogy. It never seems to occur to those who, like Mr. Cary, point out that the Hebrew word *halmah* means any young woman—whether a virgin or not—that unless Isaiah used the word in the restricted sense of virgin, as St. Matthew's quotation justifies us in believing, there was no unusual sign in the birth of the child at all. Mr. Cary rides over any consideration of this kind, and we have him dogmatically asserting that the prophet 'has no thought of any child being born outside of the usual course of nature,' and that the application of the passage to our Lord's birth indicates an apparent misunderstanding of its true meaning by the Evangelist. There are many of the children in good Church schools who know better than to say that 'there was no fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of the firstborn son of Mary,' because He 'was not called Emmanuel but Jesus;' and there are reasons to account for the rare allusions to the Virgin Birth in the New Testament which will occur to reverent minds without the necessity of supposing that this rareness 'excites doubt as to the historical value of the Synoptic account,' and which will cause them to experience surprise when they see that Mr. Cary—again dogmatically—asserts that the silence of most of the New Testament writers can only be accounted for upon one or the other of two suppositions—that our Lord's contemporaries either were ignorant that a divine parentage was claimed for Him, or that they discredited the claim. Nor is it in a work that professes to be free from dogmatic prepossessions that we ought to be told that 'the Gospel narrative of the supernatural birth is farther discredited by being inextricably interwoven with the superstitious belief of ancient times in the divine mission of dreams, and the intermingling of angelic visitants in the affairs of men' (pp. 5-10). Mr. Cary's treatment of the visit of the Magi, which we need not quote in detail, is equally unsatisfactory (p. 11). Two cases in which pregnant passages are almost totally ignored are those which contain Gabriel's words to our Lord's Mother, and those which speak of our Lord's advancement in wisdom and stature (pp. 28-9, 42-4). When Mr. Cary speaks plainly of our Lord as 'the son of Joseph and Mary,' he does not think that it is necessary to explain how absurd on that showing it is to say that a mere human child is 'born of a woman' (p. 44).

Careful readers will observe the significance of the statement with which the fourteenth section, on St. John the Baptist and his ministry, is opened—that 'at this point the narrative assumes for the first time a distinctly historical

character.' If we go to the Jordan with Mr. Cary instead of going with St. Augustine we shall see, not the Blessed Trinity, but only a legend which in St. Luke's circle was developed into an objective vision; and we must not be too sure that we stand firmly on historical ground, at all events until we have passed by the narrative of the temptation, a theme which 'the later Synoptics develop, either out of current tradition or by the free workings of fancy, into a sort of sacred drama or miracle-play.' As for the supposition that everything transpired precisely as related by the Evangelists, we must of course omit that as 'altogether uncritical' (pp. 57-60, 61-4). Perhaps the treatment of the passages in which our Lord's healing of lepers is narrated may be mentioned as a representative sample of Mr. Cary's attitude towards the Gospel miracles. He speaks of the well-known tendency of stories to grow in the frequent telling, and says that if our Lord had really possessed the power of healing leprosy He 'must often have been called upon for its exercise, and the Synoptics could not have failed to testify to the fact,' whereas there is but one other account, namely, St. Luke's narrative of the ten lepers, beside the healing of the leper in all three Synoptists, and that very likely is 'a duplicate of this.' In addition to this most uncritical suggestion that the Gospels are complete records, in utter defiance of many passages in which a large number of our Lord's miracles are grouped together in general terms, we are presented with the comment in a note on St. Luke's narrative of the ten lepers that our Lord's 'well-known real interest in the Samaritans may have led to the legendary introduction of a Samaritan into this account,' a purely gratuitous suggestion. We will further illustrate Mr. Cary's treatment of the miracles by references to the account of Jairus's daughter and the son of the widow of Nain. We are not sure what depth of unbelief is to be gathered from the comment on the first of these miracles:

'If the idea of a general resurrection from actual death is to be abandoned, it is possible, following the Tübingen and Modern Dutch Schools, to think of a myth fashioned after Old Testament models; but a more satisfactory basis of explanation is found in the Jewish custom of burying upon the day of decease and the consequent liability to premature interment, supplemented by our better present knowledge of the laws of syncope' (pp. 174-5).

After alluding to the healing of the 'king's evil,' to faith cures and the like, as freeing him from the necessity of discrediting the reality of the relief of the woman with an issue

of bl
super
Nain.
cruci
that
as on

A
for r
Lord
neces
tion
'the
frank
here
to ha
by a
pose,
our I
For
which
come
the m
becau
and o
Syno
inves
The
misse
impo
Lord
Chur
Peter
time
thoug
pray,
the in
eccles
Agai
is a
objec
since
histor
tary i
prepo
the d

of blood—who is, however, described as ‘trusting, though superstitious’—Mr. Cary passes to the son of the widow of Nain. The sole comment made to help us to understand the crucial point of this incident is that our Lord ‘does not say that the young man is not dead, but’ He ‘does address him as one would naturally address a living person’ (p. 176).

Another instance in which the reader will seek in vain for much help from Mr. Cary is in the comment on our Lord’s teaching about marriage and divorce, where the necessary discussion of our Lord’s meaning of the one exception is insufficient (pp. 107, 236). On what Mr. Cary calls ‘the true family of Jesus’ he is, as our readers will suppose, frankly Helvidian. There is worse matter in the comment here than the statement that ‘to imagine [our Lord’s brethren] to have been either cousins of Jesus, or children of Joseph by a former marriage, is to invent facts for a dogmatic purpose,’ or than the grave fault of passing over the significance of our Lord’s committal of His blessed Virgin Mother to St. John. For Mr. Cary actually speaks of the growth of the belief which he repudiates as belonging to the time ‘when Jesus had come to be deified’ (p. 156). We only allude in passing to the notes on the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand because Mr. Cary entirely discredits the narrative of St. John, and declares that ‘the simple untendent narrative’ of the Synoptists furnishes ‘the only satisfactory basis for a critical investigation into the historical value of the account’ (p. 200). The Christological import of St. Peter’s confession is entirely missed, but Roman Catholic readers will be grateful for the important remark that ‘although, rightly understood, our Lord’s reply lends no countenance to the claims of the Church of Rome with regard to the absolute primacy of Peter, it does bear distinct marks of having originated at a time when this branch of the Christian Church had, in its thought, raised Peter to the post of supreme pontiff.’ And, pray, how early may that have been is the question which, in the interests of the date of the Gospels and of true views of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, we are impelled to ask (p. 217). Against the belief that the narrative of the Transfiguration is a simple record of historical fact Mr. Cary brings the objection that it ‘involves the recognition of elements of which, since they lie without the known realm of natural law, human history can take no cognizance’ (p. 221). Yet this commentary is supposed to be the outcome of freedom from dogmatic prepossession. Further on it is dogmatically asserted that the details of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus ‘have

no dogmatic significance' (p. 243). The unwarrantable assumption that the Synoptist record can be properly interpreted apart from the narrative of St. John accounts, we suppose, for the fact that Mr. Cary does not mention, that the crowds on Palm Sunday on the Bethany road had assembled by reason of the recall of Lazarus to life (pp. 249-51). When moral and physical difficulties present themselves in the course of the sacred narrative, as for example in the incident of the barren fig-tree, it seems to be considered quite conclusive to say that 'it may be assumed that the facts were misunderstood and so perverted in transmission' (p. 255). For one of the most emphatic instances of barren comment we may refer to the half-page which is dispassionately devoted to the parable of the Prodigal Son (p. 257). Mr. Cary, it is true, says that God longs to welcome home the erring one, and adds, by way of bathos, that all the details of the parable are in harmony with the conditions of Oriental life. If anyone thinks that this is an exceptional case, let him turn to a similar half-page which contains, if possible, scantier material on the parable of the Good Samaritan (p. 265).

We must ask leave to trust in the divinely-guided faith of nineteen centuries of Christians, rather than in Mr. Cary's critical faculty, when he tells us that the only view of the Last Supper which does justice to the simplicity of our Lord's language, and its perfect fitness to the circumstances of the occasion, is that He was not consciously instituting a sacrament for a Church which as yet had no existence, but was only asking of the twelve that whenever they should meet together for a common meal, after His departure from them, they should remember how He had given His body and blood—that is, His whole life—for them (p. 298). Such exegesis as this is not likely to appeal with much force to those who have personally met the Lord Himself in the Sacrament of His love, and who believe that that intercourse with Him is as much a historical fact in their lives as any occurrence which has happened to them. They will not cease to believe in the fact because other persons are blind to it, and like the colour-blind do not know that they are blind, but say that they see. The Christological import of the agony in the garden and the teaching of the incident in regard to prayer are grievously passed over, but Mr. Cary adds a note to tell us that the presence of the angel 'has every appearance of being a legendary accretion' (p. 301).

After their experience of the commentary in the earlier parts of the Gospel narrative our readers will shrink from

the tr
charg
the d
which
friend
veil o
visibl
whole
with
of the
flectiv
clusio
comm
all on
fullest
stood
ascen
to giv
of ve
St. M
narra
narra
vario
away
our L
comp
testify
to ha
worth
tion a
of my
of un
vision
of 'in
there
indica
ducts
Gosp
Gosp
as bei
He h
subje
posed
With
satisf

the treatment of the incidents of the Cross, but we must discharge our unwelcome duty and report that Mr. Cary calls the darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour 'a true myth' which typified 'the gloom which was in the hearts of the friends of Jesus,' and similarly disposes of the rending of the veil of the temple, the earthquake, and the resurrection and visible appearance of the bodies of the saints (p. 315). The whole story of the watch, we are told, 'must be looked upon with suspicion' (p. 319), and there are features in the story of the walk to Emmaus 'which are best ascribed to the reflective imagination of a later time' (p. 320). At the conclusion of St. Matthew's Gospel 'there is not, as is so commonly supposed, a prescribed baptismal formula, least of all one involving a recognition of trinitarian doctrine.' In its fullest form the narrative of the Ascension 'cannot be understood otherwise than as intended to describe a bodily ascension to a local heaven,' but then the clauses which seem to give some degree of precision to St. Luke's account 'are of very doubtful genuineness.' The concluding section of St. Mark's Gospel is discussed briefly as the 'post-resurrection narrative in another form,' and finally we have a review of the narrative of the Resurrection as a whole, and a note on the various theories by which it has been explained, or explained away. With regard to the post-resurrection appearances of our Lord, Mr. Cary observes that it is St. Luke 'the late compiler, and the still later writer of the fourth Gospel, who testify so fully to events of which their predecessors appear to have known nothing, or nothing which they judged to be worthy of repetition.' None of the accounts under consideration are 'free from that vagueness and obscurity and that air of mystery which are among the surest signs of the presence of unhistorical elements in a narrative.' Such matters as the visions of angels belong, with the 'birth stories,' to the class of 'involuntarily poetizing' legends, and in the whole story there is 'an utter absence of truly historical conditions, indicating that the growth of legend has overloaded with products of the imagination the simple testimony of the primitive Gospel. In accounting for the fact that 'the writers of the Gospel represent all but very few of the friends of our Lord as being persuaded that after having died upon the Cross He had returned to life,' Mr. Cary, who has written on the subject of the pierced side in a Unitarian review, seems disposed to think as well of the swoon theory as of any other. With the remark that the late Professor Milligan has dealt satisfactorily with such substitutes for the Gospel facts as

these, we may leave Mr. Cary to the enjoyment of his theory. With a purely human Christ and no miracles, with no atoning death and no grace from above, with no supernatural intercourse with heaven and no angels, it cannot much matter what particular theory we adopt to explain the delusion of the Apostles. But there are awkward facts in Mr. Cary's way. The Christian Sunday somehow took the place of the Jewish Sabbath, the living organism of the Christian Church began its career of benediction in this lower world, millions of men who deserve as much credence as Mr. Cary have been conscious of the personal assistance of their Risen Lord from St. Stephen and St. Paul downwards, the evidential value of the Holy Eucharist must be reckoned with, and every Easter Day, yea and every triumph in the Christian struggle, give a flat denial to Mr. Cary's eviscerated Christianity. Professing to approach the Gospels with freedom from dogmatic prepossessions, he has lost no chance of cutting out every supernatural event from the narrative, and leaves us with the lame conclusion that 'with the birth of Christianity there came into the world a development and strengthening of that faith in a future life which before had been the possession of comparatively few' (p. 331).

We gladly turn from this unsatisfactory work upon the Gospels to Dr. Knowling's commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. The starting-point of the Acts of the Apostles, we may appropriately here remind ourselves, is the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ, in His risen body actually and literally was taken up from this world and ascended into heaven, and sat down in glory on the right hand of the Majesty on high. As the Gospels conclude with that supernatural event, and the Acts of the Apostles open with it, we are reminded that the Acts contain the record of those things which our Lord Jesus continued to do and teach by His own commissioned ministry of the Apostles, His instruments and loyal agents, from the day that He was taken up. He had taught them the things concerning the kingdom of God, and in this record of their doings we are told what these parting injunctions of the King were, for the extension of that kingdom which is not of this world. When we find the Apostles carefully filling up the number of the original twelve, and adding thereunto St. Paul and St. Barnabas; when they appoint elders or presbyters in fixed places, and ordain the seven deacons; when they deliver teaching on the atoning death, the resurrection, and the expected return of our Lord to judgment in a form which is from the first described as the Apostles'

doctr
cludin
taught
by the
on the
our
that t
as He
A co
satisf
book
The
found
about
infusi
resur
His a
Churc
in His
Spirit
from
Dr. I
the h
text i
of the
the w
deal
the q
his in
of the
a ma
the b
The
canno
satisf
vexed
discu
some
are g
upon
the v
tionar
the st
of the
litera

doctrine ; when they fast, and use appointed prayers, including doubtless the prayer which our Lord Himself had taught them ; when they baptize and convey the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, and celebrate the Holy Eucharist on the Lord's Day, and quote the Old Testament as our Lord Himself had quoted it ;—then we recognize that they are putting into action the principles of the Lord as He delivered them to the chosen princes of His Kingdom. A commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, therefore, is satisfactory when it brings out these salient points of the book into prominence in a clear and straightforward way. The Christian religion is bound up altogether with the profound and morally fruitful dogmas which set forth the truth about the Incarnate Son of God, His atoning death, the infusion of new power into redeemed men through His resurrection, the supernatural and invigorating splendour of His ascension, the government and gracious provision of His Church, the full and blessed means of intercourse with Him in His Sacraments, the certainty of the guidance of His Holy Spirit, and the priceless heritage of His written Word. It is from this point of view, of course, that we must look at Dr. Knowling's work. His introduction encouraged us in the hope that we might find a satisfactory treatment of the text in detail, for he begins with a very excellent discussion of the authorship, in which he concludes that St. Luke was the writer of the whole book, and he sweeps away a good deal of very fanciful supposition which has gathered round the questions of the author's tendency, and the sources of his information. In particular there is a careful examination of the alleged dependence of St. Luke upon Josephus (p. 30), a matter which has an important bearing upon the date of the book, and naturally leads to a discussion of that point. The place of writing, as in the case of the third Gospel, cannot be determined, but Dr. Knowling can give full and satisfactory external testimony in favour of the book. The vexed questions which surround the chronology are chiefly discussed under the detailed passages where they arise, but some general references are made in the introduction, and we are glad to see that Dr. Knowling, in making some remarks upon Mr. Turner's chronology, is quite of our opinion upon the value of the chronological article in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*. The introduction concludes with some remarks on the state of the text, especially upon the relative importance of the Western text, and with some useful references to literature bearing upon the book.

The expectation of excellence which was raised in our minds by Dr. Knowling's introduction has been more than satisfied by his detailed comments, which we can of course only illustrate by a few examples. On the words 'after His passion' in i. 3, he quotes a significant remark from another writer that this word is too sacred 'to be expunged from this the only place where it occurs in the Bible,' and he points out that 'being seen of them' 'certainly does not mean that our Lord's appearances were merely visionary.' He is particularly good in his references to other works, and includes Dr. Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood* among the books which may be consulted on the meaning of 'the kingdom of God.' In i. 9, while giving a careful account of the precise language of the author, he speaks of the calm and grandeur of the event of our Lord's Ascension, and the comment on the words of the angels to the Apostles as they gazed up contains the admirable remark that 'if the mention of their northern home had reminded the disciples of their early choice by Christ and of all that He had been to them, the personal name Jesus would assure them that their Master would still be a human Friend and divine Saviour.' In the course of the comments on the great events of the day of Pentecost in chap. ii., it is pointed out that the words used of the visible signs which accompanied the outpouring of the Holy Spirit 'forbid reference to a natural phenomenon, to say nothing of the fact of the spiritual transformation of the Apostles which followed,' and any vague explanation of the significance of the supernatural occurrence is put aside by the observation that 'the thought here is not so much of fire as the token of divine favour, as of the tongue (as of fire) conferring a divine power to utter in speech divine things.' It would be difficult to improve the comments upon the meaning and authorship of the 16th and 110th Psalms, quoted by St. Peter, and Dr. Knowling very properly says that 'it is noteworthy that just as Joel speaks of God, the Lord Jehovah, pouring out of His Spirit, so the same divine energy is here attributed by St. Peter to Jesus.' A full note is given on the description of the Apostolic Church in ii. 42, and in particular it is shown that 'the breaking of the bread' is a phrase which has St. Paul's language and doctrine and the action of our Lord Himself behind it. We think ourselves that no comment on 'the prayers' in the same verse can be regarded as quite satisfactory which does not expressly refer to the Lord's Prayer. At the conclusion of the chapter longer notes are given on the gift of tongues and the community of goods. A

simi
chap
grea
when
exce
is th
discu
God
seers
with
mini
comm
in cl
comm
allus
that
bapt
bapt
into
the
ance
who
of th
on vi
the S
Conf
lengt
Dr. I
if we
impr
taken
very
the A
the p

D
follow
expec
and c
and i
the t
holds
phras
digni
that i

similar long note is inserted on St. Stephen's speech in chap. vii. But we shall perhaps not praise the notes on the great injunction of St. Paul to the Ephesian elders too highly when we say that they stand in the very forefront of the excellent materials of Dr. Knowling's commentary. Especially is this the case with the 28th verse, on which the reading is discussed, and the weight of evidence for 'the Church of God' fairly and fully exhibited, and the meaning of 'overseers' and the Christology of the passage carefully examined, with good references. For the question of the Christian ministry it will be well for the reader to consult also the comments made on the word 'deacon' and kindred words in chap. vi., and on the opening verses of chap. xiii. The comments on the various passages in the Acts in which allusion is made to Holy Baptism are full of instruction on that sacrament, and when Dr. Knowling comments on the baptism of St. Paul—who even after his conversion was baptized—he rightly observes that there was no reception into the Church without this. Perhaps no other incident in the New Testament so significantly emphasizes the importance of the sacrament of regeneration as the baptism of him who was turned towards the kingdom of heaven by the voice of the Lord Jesus on the Damascus road. The comments on viii. 17 and xix. 6 say well what ought to be said about the Scriptural authority which those passages afford for Confirmation. We regret that we cannot dwell at greater length on these and on many other admirable passages of Dr. Knowling's work, and we should regret this all the more if we did not hope that we had said enough to indicate our impression of his work to our readers. Unless we are mistaken, this commentary will stand in the front rank with a very few others which really do justice to the evidence which the Acts of the Apostles contain of the supernatural life of the primitive Church.

Dr. Denney's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans follows in the same volume. In his introduction, as may be expected, he has made careful investigation into the origin and character of the Church at Rome, the occasion, purpose and integrity of the Epistle, with some useful remarks upon the text. On i. 4 we are glad to note that Dr. Denney holds that it is impossible to suppose that St. Paul used the phrase 'the Son of God' merely to designate an office or a dignity, and that while our Lord lived on earth 'there was that in Him which no connexion with David explains, but

which rested on a relation to God,' and that 'the resurrection only declared Him to be what He truly was.' But he considers that it is a mistake to say that the orthodox doctrine of two natures in the one Person of the Lord is formulated here. We should have preferred a comment to the effect that at all events it is distinctly indicated. We welcome also the remark on iii. 25 that it seems a mere whim of rigour to deny that the death of Christ is here conceived as sacrificial, and Dr. Denney says plainly that in His blood our Lord 'is endued with propitiatory power.' On the other hand there are some passages which warn us to sift Dr. Denney's materials very carefully, as is the case in the comments on v. 12-21, where we read of 'the moral atrocities that have disfigured most creeds,' and are told that the idea of baptismal regeneration 'is an irrational unethical miracle, invented by men to get over a puzzle of their own making.' Dr. Denney's prominence among religious writers of repute does not hinder us from saying that this vituperation is altogether unworthy of a serious commentator, and from reminding him that we, who hold that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is involved in the words of the Nicene Creed, base the truth of it upon the express words of our Lord to Nicodemus. Dr. Denney's account of chap. vii. is that it is the experience of the unregenerate, seen through regenerate eyes, interpreted in a regenerate mind, or in other words the Apostle's spiritual history universalized. The great passage in viii. 3 is rightly said to imply that our Lord is 'uniquely related to God,' and that with His coming 'a new saving power entered the world,' that He was 'one with us, short of sin,' and that He was sent 'to expiate sin by His sacrificial death.' This, Dr. Denney adds, is 'the centre and foundation' of St. Paul's Gospel. The punctuation of ix. 5 is fully discussed, and we are not surprised at the commentator's conclusion to refer the crucial words at the end of the passage not to our Lord but to the Father, because he has already told us that it seems to him impossible to affirm that St. Paul would express his sense of Christ's greatness by calling Him God blessed for ever. We must press upon Dr. Denney the results of the alternative. If Christ, in St. Paul's mind, were not God blessed for ever, He occupies a place in the Apostle's thought which convicts him beyond hope of excuse or escape of the idolatrous sin of putting a creature in a position which can be occupied by the Most High alone. We need not labour the old Athanasian point against the Arians. In the comments on various passages we

occas
deal
facto
the C
ligiou
origin
corde
obsen
has a
on th
matte
factor

Pr
Corin
tion.
of Go
and p
ing a
and c
great
glance
Perso
But a
Lord
he say
the in
planat
myste
we we
they i
quotat
'forma
note o
house
officer
Church
Epistle
takes
sacrific
fails to
bring
an ato
ing it
the thr
VOL.

occasionally come upon a remark which requires a good deal of explanation before it can be regarded as quite satisfactory, as in xiv. 5, where we read that 'nothing whatever in the Christian religion is legal or statutory, not even the religious observance of the first day of the week,' because it originated in faith. But the proceedings of the Church as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles go far to qualify the observation. On the whole we cannot say that Dr. Denney has added a very reliable commentary to the existing works on the Epistle to the Romans, and in several important matters, as we have seen, he falls far short of what is satisfactory, as an exposition of St. Paul's teaching.

Professor Findlay describes the First Epistle to the Corinthians as 'the Epistle of the Cross in its social application.' In his introduction he gives an account of the Church of God in Corinth, and of St. Paul's communications with it, and proceeds to make some general comments on the teaching and contents of the epistle, its language, text, history and criticism. The comment on ii. 8 hardly brings out the great dogmatic significance of ascribing a phrase which glances at the language used of Jehovah in the Psalms to a Person who had a nature in which He could be crucified. But although Professor Findlay holds that the words 'the Lord of Glory' are not a synonym for our Lord's Godhead, he says that the expression 'signifies the entire grandeur of the incarnate Lord,' and we hope that we may take that explanation in its plain sense. The notes on 'stewards of the mysteries of God' in iv. 1 are too thin to be satisfactory, and we were prepared for defective teaching on the points which they involve when we read in the introduction an approving quotation of Dr. Hort's contrast between 'functions' and 'formal offices' (p. 745). The same deficiency marks the note on xvi. 15, where we are told that the persons of the house of Stephanas 'did not constitute a body of church officers; we find no traces as yet of an official order in the Church of Corinth.' The comment on the passage in the Epistle which records the institution of the Holy Eucharist takes 'is' as the copula of symbolic being, says that the sacrificial sense put on 'do this' is without lexical warrant, fails to examine the usage of 'remembrance,' and does not bring out the fact that, the Lord's death being what it was, an atoning sacrifice in the eyes of God, the act of 'proclaiming it necessarily partakes of the nature of intercession before the throne of heaven.' Perhaps the best piece of work in Pro-

fessor Findlay's commentary is the analysis of chap. xv., with the careful notes upon its details. But for much which we have been accustomed to associate with this Epistle we must go elsewhere.

On the two Epistles to which we have just alluded we have the further aid of Dr. Drummond's commentary in the *International Handbooks* series, and he includes also in his volume, as we have seen, five other Epistles of St. Paul. No one could be expected to compress an adequate commentary upon seven of St. Paul's Epistles into a volume of less than four hundred pages, and we shall not make any grave complaint against Dr. Drummond's work because it is exceedingly thin. Indeed he himself frankly speaks of the 'inadequacy of the present little commentary.' Nor should we be disposed to find fault with a well-known Unitarian because he has produced a Unitarian commentary. But as the author tells us that his book has not been written in the interest of any sect or any particular school of thought, and as the general editor talks about freedom from dogmatic prepossessions, it may be well to say plainly that the thoroughgoing Unitarian will find nothing objectionable in the Christology of Dr. Drummond's commentary, and to add that St. Paul's chief Epistles seem to us to teach Christological doctrines which are not distinguishable from the meaning of the Nicene Creed. We cannot see any ground for admitting what is in effect Dr. Drummond's contention, that an entirely fresh and unbiassed inquiry into St. Paul's teaching leads to a Unitarian view of our Lord's Person. Beyond this matter of signal importance there are but few special features of the commentary upon which we need make any observation, and with one or two illustrations we shall conclude. Dr. Drummond accepts both the Thessalonian Epistles as the work of St. Paul, the first decidedly, the second at least provisionally. He assumes that the Apostle's 'eschatology was mistaken, a survival from his rabbinical days,' depending 'on a view of the universe which has for ever passed away' (pp. 7, 27). He cannot allow that the use of a singular verb after a complex subject, the members of which are God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, has any theological significance; but he does consider that 1 Thess. v. 12 implies that the Church had then received some organization and had presidents who exercised some amount of authoritative discipline. There are doubtless readers who will turn at once to see what Dr. Drummond makes of certain great passages in the

Cori
foret
when
as th
when
depa
Glor
desc
of G
of th
that
ment
the v
the
that
assur
was
'died
supre
suffer
heave
there
A me
is for
'freq
But
Drum
Kenc
heave
Howe
is cor
very
and i
name
Chris
specia
recogn
Chris
Paul
existe
huma
speech
ment
useles
think

Corinthian Epistles. In the introduction they will obtain a foretaste of the kind of comment which they may expect when they are reminded that 'great Christian thoughts,' such as the words of the Apostolic benediction, 'lose their identity when they stiffen into formulæ from which the divine fire has departed' (p. 54). On the words 'crucified the Lord of Glory' (1 Cor. ii. 8) Dr. Drummond says that 'Jesus is here described as one to whom the spiritual glory of the kingdom of God especially belonged. He was the Master and Leader of the new community of God's children.' On iv. 1 he says that the application of the word 'mystery' to the Sacraments is of later date, and his explanation of the copula in the words 'This is My body' (xi. 24) may be inferred from the remark that the votaries of literalism ought to believe that Jesus was really a paschal sheep. The underlying assumption in many parts of the commentary that our Lord was as one of us in kind appears in the comment on the words 'died for our sins' (xv. 3), where Dr. Drummond says 'in this supreme instance, as in so many minor instances, the innocent suffered for the guilty.' The passage 'the second man is of heaven' refers to the higher quality of our Lord's being, and therefore 'has no bearing on the question of pre-existence.' A more elaborate exhibition of Dr. Drummond's Christology is found in the note on 2 Cor. viii. 9, a verse which is 'frequently explained as referring to Christ's pre-existence.' But even in describing the orthodox interpretation Dr. Drummond does not, as we should, take care to exclude the Kenotic heresy, for his words are 'though he was rich in heavenly glory, he renounced it through the incarnation.' However, he cannot persuade himself that this interpretation is correct, and his reasons would have opened St. Paul's eyes very wide. The whole passage will be found on pp. 164-5, and in the course of it Dr. Drummond says that 'Jesus is the name of the man who lived and taught in Palestine, and Christ is the official title of a man who was anointed for a special work on earth; so that the pre-existent being (if Paul recognized such) was not Jesus Christ, but incarnate in Jesus Christ. Consequently, if the reference here is to pre-existence, Paul must have believed that the human personality pre-existed.' To us who believe that our Lord never had any human personality, and who are familiar with the figure of speech which we term *communicatio idiomatum*, such comment as this seems entirely wide of the mark and worse than useless as a guide to the Apostle's meaning. Dr. Drummond thinks that St. Paul's language about the Holy Spirit at the

close of chap. iii. is 'linguistically inaccurate' (p. 147), and on the great atonement passage in v. 21 we find little that is more helpful than the opening remark that 'this is one of those great sayings of Paul's which suggest so much, and for that very reason leave it uncertain what precise shade of meaning he intended to convey.' The long note on grace in Gal. i. 3 is of course deficient, because the writer neither believes in the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation nor in the sacramental principle which is indissolubly connected with it. On ii. 20 Dr. Drummond does not say what ought to be said, that there is a true sense in which our Lord gave Himself instead of many as well as on their behalf. The comment on iii. 20 of course makes no allusion to the fact that, whatever interpretation be given to these difficult words, the argument is based upon a belief in our Lord's Godhead; nor under iv. 4 are we reminded how superfluous it would be to say, of one who was a human being and nothing more, that he was born of a woman. There are some indications here and elsewhere that Dr. Drummond supposes Nestorianism to be the Catholic faith, for he is ever finding a human personality in the way, and seems to use that as a reason for excluding a belief in our Lord's divine personality. At the beginning of the notes on the Epistle to the Romans we come upon a more emphatically hostile tone, and are told that 'whatever inference the dogmatic theologian may legitimately draw, it is highly improper for the interpreter to introduce theological terms, such as Trinity, which are not found in Christian literature till long after the time of Paul.' That is an old ruse with which the Church has been familiar since the first days of Arian evasions, and the reply to it is that precise theological terms are defences to shut out meanings which we believe the sacred writers would have utterly repudiated, and which are rendered necessary by attempts to explain away inspired language. The long note on 'saints' in Rom. i. 7 contains a carefully drawn conclusion that holiness enters essentially into the ideal of the Christian character; but here again a very different note would have been written by one who had entered into the fulness of St. Paul's teaching about the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, the mystical body of Christ, and the Communion of Saints. In the note on iii. 25 is another passage which seems to imply that our Lord's death was not different in kind from that of the martyrs (p. 282). St. Paul's use of the term 'the Son of God' is examined in the note on viii. 3, which is a fair illustration of Dr. Drummond's Christology. The following appear to him to be 'legitimate results':

with
spirit
by p
gene
view
conn
the
pote
sens
nenc

It w
mad
Rom
in t
Dr.
of I
was
the
'his
it to
our
Dr.
is, w
was
mon
lang
in th
Mar
that
of '
has
stan
but

W
on v
com
pres
amp
the
regre
up w
Dr. l

'(1) The Son is always distinguished from God, and is identified with Jesus, the historical man. (2) Jesus was the Son of God in a spiritual, in contradistinction from an official or metaphysical sense, by possession of the Spirit of holiness, and not by the mode of his generation in time or eternity. Whatever may have been Paul's view of the pre-existence of Christ (or of all souls), he nowhere connects sonship with ideas of that kind. (3) Christ's sonship was the same, in essence, as that which belongs to other men; to all potentially; to those who are led by the Spirit of God, in its full sense. (4) Nevertheless, to Jesus is assigned a marked pre-eminence,' &c. (p. 308).

It would be simply to repeat evidence of what is already made clear if we were to quote Dr. Drummond's remarks on Rom. ix. 5 and Phil. ii. 5-11. But there are some sentences in these passages which are too significant to be omitted. Dr. Drummond sees clearly enough that if the crucial words of Rom. ix. 5 are applied to our Lord, they suggest that He was 'the sole supreme God,' and he says that if St. Paul held the doctrine involved in this mode of understanding his words 'his mind must have been full of it, and we should expect it to be flashing perpetually into vivid phrases.' But in our belief that is exactly what we do find, and all that Dr. Drummond quotes from St. Paul in support of another view is, we hold, sufficiently explained by bearing in mind that it was supremely necessary for the Apostle, in dealing with monotheistic Jews, to avoid a charge of tritheism, that his language shows that he believed in a distinction of persons in the being of the one God, and that he believed in the true Manhood of the Divine Saviour. On Phil. ii. 5-11 the remark that 'he forsook the form of God' is the usual explanation of 'emptied himself' shows perhaps how far Kenotic language has spread. We need only add that Dr. Drummond understands the word 'form' to imply not metaphysical essence, but participation in the Divine spirit of love (p. 378).

We have now said enough, we trust, to show our readers on what principles we estimate the value of New Testament commentaries, and what they may expect to find in these present volumes. The *International Handbooks* are sad examples of what such commentaries ought not to be, and in the second volume of the *Expositor's Bible* it is matter for regret that the really excellent work of Dr. Knowling is bound up with the very inferior and unsatisfactory commentaries of Dr. Denney and Professor Findlay.

ART. II.—RITSCHLIANISM AND CHURCH DOCTRINE.

1. *The Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith.* By JAMES ORR, M.A., D.D., Professor of Church History in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh. (London, 1897.)
2. *Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology, with some References to the Ritschlian View of Theology and History of Doctrine.* By HUGH M. SCOTT, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Chicago Theological Seminary. (Chicago, 1896.)
3. *The Ritschlian Theology, Critical and Constructive.* By ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A. (Oxon.) and B.D. (Glas.). (Edinburgh, 1899.)
4. *Les Principes Philosophiques de la Théologie de Ritschl.* Par ROBERT FARRE. (Vevay, 1894.)
5. *Esquisse d'une Philosophie de la Religion.* Par AUGUSTE SABATIER. Cinquième Edition. (Paris, 1898.)
6. *The Vitality of Christian Dogmas.* By A. SABATIER, D.D., with a Preface by the Very Rev. the Hon. W. H. FREMANTLE, D.D., Dean of Ripon. (London, 1898.)
7. *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion.* Von ALBRECHT RITSCHL. Fünfte Auflage. (Bonn, 1895.)

WHILE the Church of England is engaged in controversy concerning the methods of divine worship, the schools of Germany and Scotland busy themselves with equal interest and not less dissension about the methods of knowing God and His revelation.

We make no doubt that to many engaged upon either subject of discussion the other appears relatively unimportant. There are disputants among the deep-thinking peoples whom we have named to whom the burning of incense and the lighting of candles seem childish matters for grown persons to notice, either in the way of practice or prevention; and there are champions among our practical English to whom mysterious and difficult theology seems to have no claim on human attention in comparison to the practice of the service of God. But that depends. If the Germans and the Scotch were but seeking after wisdom like the Greeks of old, without message for the souls of men or motives to make them holy, the ingenuity of their arguments should not win from us any judgment in their favour. And if the controversies upon

ritual moved merely among externals and were prompted by a spirit of contention, not by zeal for salvation and the glory of God, we should care nothing for them.

We are far, indeed, from charging either movement with such emptiness, and can well discern the points of view in which either of these controversies may assume an aspect both high and worthy of a man. We can even name many individual leaders in either war—and upon either side in either war—under whom a good fight might be fought, and a path to glory found. But for the present it is not among vestments or ornaments, or even among prayers and sacred practices, that we must employ ourselves, but among the very recondite systems of thought which are called by the name Ritschlianism, which, however it may resemble Ritualism in sound, is wide as the poles from it in subject and tendency.

Many of the writers who in a general way adhere to this way of thinking are too independent and original to permit us to suppose them blind followers of a master through the mazes of his various thinking. Neo-Kantian would be, perhaps, a better appellation than Ritschlianism. At all events, we feel as safe in tracing any system of modern, and especially German, thought up to Kant, as an ancient poet was in connecting his theme with the Trojan war. We need but remind our readers that Kant rigidly, and by strictest demonstration, marks all our knowledge, properly so-called, as confined to phenomena and shut within the limits and conditions of what is seen and observed. But when it seems as if the door was about to close without the admission of one ray of the supernatural to enlighten our earthly sense, the mighty explorer discovers in our moral nature an element incapable of this world's forging, and bearing the stamp of eternity. Thus eternal power and godhead appear among the things that are made, commanding them, yet not mingling among them. Upon this basis Kant himself, and many of those who followed him, built an edifice of religion which gave to their souls a certain felt connexion with 'the beyond.' But Kantian religion, saved so as by fire from the overpowering earthliness in which human knowledge is held to be sunken, is stern and penurious in its condescension to human wants when compared with that religion which has descended to us from the days when intercourse seemed easy between heaven and earth, and even miracle not impossible. Still, so striking a recognition of the entrance of the eternal into this world of things, made after so rigid analysis on the part of such a master, was a barrier

against the assaults of a materialistic age, in which physical science put forward claims of universal dominion. It has, indeed, been claimed by Mr. Spencer and others that evolution in the natural world is capable of developing the categorical imperative of conscience in our souls without any resort beyond it. But we well know what physical nature can produce as generations pass; it is very useful and of great moral importance, but it is not the imperative of conscience. For the Kantian, therefore, it is once for all impossible to accept physical science as an account of the moral world.

Moreover, the categorical imperative enters into many combinations, and it is not easy to see why the supernatural origin which essentially belongs to the command should be forbidden to extend itself to the subject of the command. 'Saul! Saul! why persecutest thou Me?' came to his conscience from beyond the phenomenal world, and Saul himself was never able to distinguish the heavenly command from a heavenly sanction of Christianity. How should he? If we believe that a divine voice forbids us a certain act, in definite tones, which no earthly circumstance can account for, can we assure ourselves that it would be exceeding its own powers or our receptive capacities if it gave a detailed message with application to a larger and more connected series of phenomena? Good reason has been shown for a belief that Kant's moral principles admit and require in natural religion a wider and more spiritual application than he himself gave to them;¹ the argument seems very applicable to revealed religion also.

We cannot, therefore, wonder that, instead of suppressing for ever the faith of the Gospel, the philosophy of Kant in some minds developed a quite opposite effect. Philosophy, indeed, in even a Christian form, will suppress religion *ipso facto* if the soul takes no other food; it is abstract, while religion is concrete; it is reflective, while religion is active. There is as much difference between religion and philosophy as there is between the actual care and cultivation of plants and the botanical investigations which concern them. But it is only in philosophic schools that such exclusiveness prevails. Philosophy passes out into the educated world in that active power which its tenets are fitted to exercise; and Kant's did not exercise a wholly unspiritual influence or forbid intercourse between man and a living God. The very forms and doctrines in which the intercourse had expressed itself for

¹ See Dr. Bernard's Introduction to his translation of *Kant's Kritik of Judgment*, p. xi. sq.; and Kennedy's *Natural Theology and Modern Thought*, Lect. vi. p. 260.

so ma
the e
partic
words
to the
But th
of fail
ance,

It
formu
favou
and c
syllab
it wa
spher
produ
cums
the r
denon
of dis
forms
for t
ab o
that
part
part
lump
mora
sible
into
intell
of H
impe
impe
of b
the v
selve
cially
our
and
we fi
conc
is no
scien
term

so many centuries subsisted even after Kant, and that with the emphasis which particular doctrines had acquired in particular parts of Christendom. In many cases the old words had ceased to possess the interest which once belonged to them, especially those dating from post-Reformation times. But they stood embodied in symbolical books and professions of faith, and, if not exactly in their original form and importance, were still connected with national feeling.

It is impossible, indeed, to avoid the admission that many formulæ in which sections of the Church embodied each its favourite tenet come almost as much from phenomenal and earthly sources as from supernatural. Once the very syllables of their definitions had been thought divine. But it was at best human argumentation within the limited sphere of religion which human intellect can reach that had produced this impression; and when human passion and circumstance faded away from the controversy it fell down to the regions of earth. Thus Christian people of whatever denomination ought to allow to the followers of Kant a liberty of discerning something local and occasional in many cherished forms of Christian profession, and reserve the term Catholic for that which has been practically held *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*. On the other hand the Kantian ought to allow that it is impossible to keep the supernatural out of every part of religion unless you can keep it wholly out of every part of human thought. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, and the supernatural admitted in even the region of morals will overspread the whole of life. We grant it impossible to deny that in morality and religious feeling we come into contact with God in ways which we cannot reduce to intellectual conceptions nor reconcile with our experience of Him as Creator of the universe and Ruler of a finite and imperfect world. But these difficulties experienced by our imperfect faculties in our contact with the eternal regions of being hardly move our surprise. We feel assured of the unity of the divine being and attributes within themselves, though we be unable to harmonize them; more especially as we experience very similar difficulty in reducing our own spiritual nature to a harmony in its inward being and outward relations. But, poor creatures though we be, we find a power of contact with God within, and we cannot conceive that the 'architect of the world' who put it there is not Himself also eternal God and inspirer of our consciences with the moral law. Indeed, when we pursue the term 'architect of the universe,' in which Kant chooses to

express the limited powers of the Creator of a finite world, we find that it leads us to something as unlimited as the moral law itself. Creation even of a limited world is in itself a transcendental power beyond our intellects to grasp, any more than we can grasp and understand the moral imperative which works in a finite world though itself infinite. The two transcendentials have alike their roots in infinity and their applications and work in what is finite; and we seem forced to think of them as inherent in the same Infinite Love.

But Kant's wondrous and light-giving system in the state in which he left it seemed to leave one great component part of the idea of God too much in the light under the view of our limited understanding, and the other too much in the dark under the mystery of our moral nature. The nature of his countrymen is wondrously mingled of audacity in thought and reverence of sentiment. And to them the combination of enthusiastic Christianity with very negative criticism of the Creed is not as impossible as to us Englishmen whose refusal to go with them in criticism, together with our apathy in religious feeling, shocks our Teutonic brethen.

The rise and wide acceptance of Ritschlianism seems to be due to the condition and tendencies of the German mind. The central nature of this movement and the character in which it claims its chief merit lies in the expulsion of metaphysics from the necessary spiritual furnishing of Christian souls. It is matter of astonishment to the English mind that the Germans, whose very breath of life metaphysics are supposed to be, should themselves protest against them. It should be remembered, however, that the Gracchi may complain of sedition, and in general all sorts of people impute to others the very sins to which they are themselves addicted. In fact, the sequel will show that the Ritschlians use by far more of metaphysical argument to prove themselves entitled to use the ordinary terms of theology than those who have used them throughout the centuries.

The expulsion of metaphysics means the refusal to recognize the world behind the physical as known and existing as truly as the physical. We must be excused for thinking that the surrender would not be offered but for the imperious demands of physical science to dominate all our earthly experience. Our readers will not need to hear what is lost to the faith on such principles as these. They will say that under it there is no more faith in the Christian religion remaining. The Deity of our Lord, His resurrection, and His kingdom at God's right hand must depart. The whole

Nic
it,
nati
phy
the
phy
men
pos
wor
in
imp
per
ther
que
clai
asse
thin
wor
con

tian
men
only
Chr
and
dev
pro
Rit
of
me
lati
is
rev
obe
Suc
it w
Lon
as
req
ena
per
to
div
tow
hur

Nicene Creed in the sense in which those took it who made it, all belief concerning the Incarnation and the twofold nature of the Lord vanish from our view. These are metaphysical in the sense in which Ritschl chooses to understand the word: that is to say, they concern the world beyond the physical world. They enter into the faith and the conduct of men in this world only on the supposition that there is a possible intercourse between the two. The men of this world entertain the belief that only through real existence in the unseen world can these great unseen verities be of importance to them here. Yet the learned and religious persons who originated the school do not consent to divest themselves of any of the ancient terms of the faith. And the question therefore occurs how or in what sense of belief they claim to use them, while divesting them of those troublesome assertions of the interference of supernatural powers in human things, and of the interference of human existences in the world beyond the grave which have ever been supposed to be contained in Christian faith.

It is, indeed, not possible for those who believe in Christianity as hitherto understood, to regard the Ritschlian movement as holding the faith. And yet it is certain that not only a formal adherence but an enthusiastic affection to Christ and Christianity has developed under its influence; and that, not among the weak and unthinking, but among devoted workers and profound students of religion. The proportion of men of this stamp, whom it is fair to class as Ritschlians, both in Germany and among the Protestants of France, is quite beyond the average which other movements can boast of. Yet the common evidences of revelation are not used by this school. In their view Christianity is really the sole revelation; and in Christianity the sole revelation is to Christ. Thereby, or by the perfection of His obedience to it, He becomes an absolute image of God to us. Such views distinguish Ritschlianism from Socinianism. But it will seem clear to the English mind that as regards the Lord Himself such a history is plainly miraculous, and that as regards our belief in Him some divine assistance is required above the ordinary powers of the mind, in order to enable us to grasp and believe so tremendous a fact as a perfection in the man Christ Jesus which should make Him to us a transcript of God, and warrant us in giving Him the divine name. How was the love and devotion of disciples towards the Lord to be sustained if He shared the lot of humanity, both good and bad, and passed from the earthly

scene? The reply of the Creeds is certainly the reply of the Apostle; that His resurrection gave Him back in truth and reality to His followers, who for the moment thought they had lost Him for ever, and never imagined in themselves any fund of power which could supply His place.

But the resurrection is a miracle which, according to the Ritschlians, the laws of the mind do not permit us to believe in an objective sense. There exists, however, in the mind a power to exercise judgments of value (*Werthurtheile*): that is to say, to nourish and retain those conceptions which it finds essential to its well-being. And in this character not only the resurrection but the deity of Christ presented themselves to the early Christians, and still present themselves to us. They are ideas which, though in the earthly and ordinary sense which both believers and opponents have attached to them they are not true, yet in the view of those in whom the impulses of Christianity work are the very breath of the higher life. It is good, says the Ritschlian, to believe these things, and believe them we will, even though our intellects refuse to admit them as facts.

Church people are, of course, ready to pronounce that a Christianity founded upon such a basis would be a mere make-belief. We cannot think that a life such as that of the Lord, so real in facing the facts of the world that surrounded Him, and drawing disciples by its high conception of truth, would include in the very time of its appearance so large a measure of unreality and self-deception. We refuse to suppose that it requires, in order to make it a permanent possession for men, a structure so resembling falsehood. But we are checked in these indignant assertions of the necessary ineffectiveness of the system by the question whether the process has not actually taken place in large departments of the Christian Church, and even caused the addition to the Gospel of doctrines and of histories which multitudes consider to be as essential to its substance and its practice as any of the records in the New Testament itself. Consider the list of doctrines and of practices concerning the Blessed Mother of our Lord, which the Roman Catholic Church accepts with so much faith and enthusiasm. There are, to be sure, many devout Roman Catholics who accept the whole system of devotion to the Blessed Virgin upon authority: by which they mean not the authority which a great scholar in any line, exercises within his own subject, but the authority which a ruler exerts over his people or a general over his soldiers. It has been sadly proved in the Dreyfus case how

easily
to c
In s
called
their
and f
mirac
of th
at R
the a
inwa
those

T
only
the v
she l
witho
subje
of th
they
of a
woul
the f
relati
them
woul
mora
to ob
pract
natio
certai
he w
thing
afford
hear
Strau
faith
that t
down
judgm
of Ro
of fai
Chris
H
of the

easily authority to command actions may assume the right to command beliefs, and be accepted instead of evidence. In such cases there is no judgment of value, properly so called. It is likely that many Roman Catholics when asked their reason for addressing and adoring the Blessed Virgin, and for believing in the legend of her Assumption and other miraculous incidents regarding her, would name the authority of the Church, and would mean thereby the existing rulers at Rome. Yet authority cannot in all cases be the cause of the acceptance. Beliefs so intimate and of such constant inward use cannot be imposed by mere authority even upon those who most desire to obey it.

The fact is, as we well know, that the Church has not only in the adoration of the Blessed Virgin led her people in the way in which she knows they desire to be led, but that she herself has been led, in part consciously and in part without knowing it, by the inclinations of the mass of her subjects, of whom by far the larger number are unconscious of the rules of evidence. She has been led by them, and they by their judgments of value. They accept this custom of addressing by word of mouth a person who otherwise would not be credited with more power to hear them than the friend who died yesterday, just because the belief in this relation is so infinitely welcome, beautiful, and valuable to them. Therefore, they so entirely believe in it that they would die for it, and commit to it so large a share in their moral and spiritual guidance that it would sometimes appear to obscure the more primitive forms of Christian faith and practice. Pope Leo XIII., when exhorting a great and thinking nation to return to his fold, suggested to them the use of certain prayers addressed to the Blessed Virgin. The surer he was that this nation neither believed nor practised anything of the sort, the plainer was the proof which he thus afforded of deep and simple faith in the fact that she could hear them. We confess for ourselves that nothing that Strauss or Renan ever wrote came so near to shaking our faith in our religion as the question whether it were possible that the belief of those who first received it and handed it down to us could have been grounded as much upon mere judgments of value as that on which the immense multitude of Roman Catholics build their lavishness of adoration and of faith toward the Blessed Virgin; for then we could not be Christian except in the Ritschlian sense.

However, the doubt can be set at rest without any forcing of the truth. The adoration of the Blessed Virgin arose in

times far less fitted to be our guides in faith than those of our Lord and His Apostles. It has no witnesses to call in its favour worthy of comparison with the Apostles of our Lord either for character, competence, or number, or for the distinctness of the testimony which they bear. The whole system of Mariolatry hangs on to the Christianity of the Bible without any solidarity. It originates more in the natural affection of children to their mothers or men for good women than in any theological principle. And we frequently discover proofs that, however effusive and prominent the cultus of the Blessed Virgin may be, multitudes of the very best within the Roman Church could dispense with it and content themselves with trust in the Saviour. But the cultus is at least well fitted to give us a conception how much may be done by beliefs which are purely ideal, and which even their defenders cannot invest with the same kind of truth that belongs to earthly facts.

The Roman Catholic Church is by no means the only quarter in which judgments of value are treated as proper evidences of truth. There are multitudes of popular sermons delivered, not only by Salvation Army preachers but even in the pulpits of our own communion, in which the felt need of a Saviour, and the subjective persuasion that He has been found, pushed home by zealous believers, supply all that is thought needful for a persuasion that He really exists. This is perfectly in accordance with a particular Ritschlian doctrine which some have considered an essential part of the system: that the preachers of the system must themselves have experienced its value to the soul. We do not undervalue such conversions as those to which we allude. We look with much sympathy upon the sinner's belief that none but One whom men whose word he trusts offer to him as a Saviour, could really work such wonders within his soul unless He was what they assert Him to be. We hold, indeed, that no less a witness than the Catholic Church has in the last resort the power and right to offer external testimony which the listener may complete by his inward assent. But the fact that conversions are so often effected when the agency that offers the belief is of very slight authority, enables us to realize how the same thing might be done upon the grounds of mere human feeling, and be accompanied by the refusal to consider dogma at all. A due and adequate inquiry into the application of Ritschlian principles to the Holy Eucharist would occupy more space than we have at our disposal. We suggest the subject for the reflection of the reader, only

adding
theol
parts
could
Litur
mode

C
tion
retic
to us
in a p
fully
use ;
calls
itself
that
little
While
all kn
in rel
upon
works
sents
the in

'T
in it
object
parts
ledge)
viewed
form
its spr
But th
but ex
above
forth,
their v
craving

No
judgm
form
desire
value
that d
just b

adding that, whatever claim be set up on the part of the new theology that its principles have not been inactive in some parts of the history of the Eucharist, their total adoption could not fail to render impossible the candid use of the Liturgy of any Church in existence, whether ancient or modern.

Closely connected with judgments of value is the distinction which Ritschlianism draws between religious and theoretic knowledge. The distinction, so far as it is real, seems to us to lie between knowledge in a theoretic and knowledge in a practical form; between knowledge stored up respectfully on the shelves and knowledge taken down for immediate use; between the knowledge that we have overnight of the calls of the morning, and the same knowledge as it presents itself to us when the moment for getting up has arrived. At that critical time we find out by experience how much or how little our theory upon the subject is worth to us in reality. While this distinction between theory and reality exists in all knowledge, there is none where it appears so constantly as in religion. We are not surprised that varying statements upon this subject can be quoted from Ritschl's successive works. The form, however, in which the idea finally presents itself is one in which, as Professor Orr remarks (p. 66), the influence of Lotze is very manifest.

'The mind, we are taught, relates itself to the impressions excited in it in a twofold way. Either it directs its attention upon them as objectively given, and seeks to connect them with one another as parts of a system of nature through the causal word (theoretic knowledge), or it estimates them according to their worth for the subject viewed as susceptible of pleasure and pain (value judgments). No form of theoretic knowledge is absolutely disinterested; it has always its spring in some form of desire and is accompanied by feeling. But there are judgments which have no tinge of a theoretic element, but express values only—such, *e.g.*, as our aesthetic, our moral, and, above all, our religious judgments—their peculiarity is that they set forth, not the objective nature and relations of things, but exclusively their value *for us*—their fitness to meet and satisfy some want or craving of the feeling self.'

Now, it is common experience that as the most theoretic judgments of value have, as here stated, their spring in some form of desire, so, on the other hand, in those acts which desire most immediately prompts there is a judgment of value however rapid. The drunkard judges in calm moments that drink is killing him, and its cost or value is death; but just before he takes the glass this previous judgment is for-

gotten, and he judges that its contents are worth to him so much of delight. Both these are judgments of value ; but in the one experience and testimony are the bases of the judgment and overrule desire, in the other the reverse. In religion a man in some moments judges that to follow Christ is to save his soul ; in temptation he judges that to follow Christ means pain and self-denial. So plain is it that both these are judgments of value that one can scarcely say which is the judgment where experience overcomes desire, and which the reverse ; or whether all men will have on this point the same experience, and say that they were led by desire towards good, and experience towards evil, or *vice versa*. In all kinds of judging, whether in morals, æsthetics, religion, or any other, judgments may be otiose or practical. No real contrast exists between theoretical judgments and religious ; the real contrast lies between such judgments as are hasty and such as are permanent and thoughtful, and man's aim should be to take care lest those of the former sort should slip past the genuine *Werthurtheile*, and, like a racer at Epsom, win the prize of life.

We find in St. John vi. 68-9 an instance of the exercise of a judgment of value in the words of St. Peter : ' Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.' Here are no metaphysical reasons for the belief which the Apostle expresses. Yet it is truly a creed ; it is a theological belief, which in the hands of another man, or in those of the same man in a different mood, might be made the subject of thought and inquiry, deeply taxing and absorbing to the intellect. It might indeed be the solemn conclusion of a general council. As it stands, it glows with delight, and is at once a judgment of the value of the companionship and the speech of the Lord, an expression of St. Peter's mind as to the nature of Him who can speak so, and an outburst of love leading direct to action. To secure the continuance of that conviction of the mind and that glow of the heart, with its results in action, was the proper work of the Apostles and their successors for all time. But one would consider it impossible without the continuance of the presence of the Lord. If He were to die, the remembrance of Him and of His blessed words might still remain ; a judgment of value, but relatively inactive. To restore His presence with its living effect, by an effort of the imaginative faculty or any other power of the mind, if it were not restored in fact and by the act of God, could not be done. St. Peter's words stood

true
God
had

that
with
by u
to p
min
one
thro
in C
Lotz
ing
worl

world
even
true
exist
nobl
word
learn
perfe
Him

We
work
well
from
prin
such
Lotz

V
great
which
of w
attac
witho
stand
porti
tend

B
taugh

VO

true for himself up to the last, but only for the reason that God restored the Lord Jesus as literally and truly as Peter had known Him before His death.

Ritschl's philosophy adopts a certain modification of that of Kant, induced, it would appear, through intercourse with Lotze, which allows the intercourse with God experienced by us in the moral imperative, to make some such approach to phenomena as may give it a theoretical conception for the mind and an intelligible contact with things. Lotze is at one with Kant in regarding contact with God as coming through our moral nature and leading to the firm belief in God as Living Love. Thirteen years ago we reviewed Lotze's great work entitled *Microcosmus*, and gave the following account of his idea of man's relations to God and His world.

'Following the example of the Creator Spirit which moves in the world of phenomena and develops there in innumerable forms and events, man, however conscious that only with God and in God is true bliss to be found, must devote himself to "develop given existence to a knowledge of its value," and the most edifying fact in noble human lives is their obedience to this law. As we read these words we inevitably think of Him who though He were a Son yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him.'

We were not at the time acquainted with the writings or the work of Ritschl, nor of his intimacy with Lotze, but we can well perceive how Lotze's tenets should have been developed from those of Kant in the desire to render that great thinker's principles more applicable to human life, and how potent such tenets may have been in suggestion to Ritschl,² who was Lotze's fellow-professor at Göttingen.

We do not, however, imagine that our readers would be greatly interested in tracing the kind and degree of influence which other philosophers may have exercised upon the author of whom we treat. It is surprising how much importance is attached in Germany to these questions of suggestion from without. No doubt it may sometimes give help in understanding an author, to learn that he derived an important portion of his system from some predecessor of well-known tendency.

But in England we desire chiefly to know what a man taught, and the question whether he was obliged to any

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 311.

² See also Prof. Orr, p. 46.

other has for us at best a subordinate interest. We pass over, then, the question whence Ritschl derived his method in order to pursue the inquiry what his method was. Some say that it lies in the separation of theology from theory and dogma. Some that it consists in deriving everything in theology from revelation in the person of the historical Christ. He himself says that 'the idea of the Christian religion is reached through the orderly reproduction of the series of the thoughts of Christ and His Apostles.' Some, as we have lately remarked, hold it to consist in the demand that a theologian should write as a believing member of the Christian community. All these are demands made by Ritschl, and Professor Orr, in his excellent study of the movement, takes them all into account, while himself regarding as the highest principle of Ritschlian theology 'the sole revelation value of Christ in contrast with all commingling of faith with philosophy or nature knowledge.'¹

However, it must be remembered that whether it be through philosophy or natural knowledge or sceptical inclination, there is some external power which forbids Ritschl to understand the supernatural events in our Lord's life in this world and beyond it as the consensus of His adherents in former centuries have understood them. Most people will agree that this difference robs of their ordinary meaning those expressions of entire subjection to Christ and satisfaction with His revelation which present so much attraction in the utterances of Ritschl, and still more in those of some of his adherents. It is one thing to give oneself and all that one possesses to Christ, and take from Him all that He has to give, if Christ be more really present to give and receive than when the bodily eye could see Him. But it is different if the process by which He becomes present is subjective, and depends upon the effort by which we realize what he was to those who were in personal contact with Him. Belief, in that saving sense of which we read in the New Testament, was not an affair of the intellect alone, but of the whole active nature. But in the Ritschlian system all the effects of the Lord's presence in filling the souls of His disciples with personal love are withdrawn; yet to the judgment of value which remains, denuded as it is of so much of its practical power, is left the awful function of defending the title of the Lord to be called God. The predicate of Godhead is retained, but only as expressive of the revelation-worth of Christ—of His religious value. It is a term of

¹ Orr, p. 49.

valu
pos

that
of th

Lor

His

stan

as th

natu

phys

show

ask

'WH

say

mor

and

Rits

refus

I

Rits

of it

dom

to G

the

impe

it im

spirit

and

in H

He is

life;

of ou

aid, a

Him

to all

of H

be fr

¹ C

² I

Trans

³ 4

und d

rechts

St. Joh

claim

value, not of essence or of dignity of nature.¹ But it is not possible to retain the value without the essence.

If, indeed, the intention of Ritschlianism in general was that which Dean Fremantle attributes to an eminent member of the party, of pressing upon us the moral bearing of the Lord's divine nature as inseparable from our exaltation of His person, we could very heartily agree. If the Dean understands rightly, Sabatier 'would wish such expressions as those of the Nicene Creed which assert our Lord's divine nature to be retained, but to be felt more than their metaphysical character would mean to men of our day. He would show their moral bearing.'² Surely; for what is needed but to ask ourselves with more earnestness the Lord's question: 'Why call ye Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?' But there is no subtraction of metaphysical from moral in this process; it is addition, if necessary, of meaning and power to the divine titles which we give to Christ. But Ritschl believes that it is possible to retain the value while refusing to assert the essence and the dignity.³

Professor Orr proceeds to consider in the next place Ritschl's view of the nature of religion itself. The peculiarity of it consists in this—that he connects religion with man's dominion over the world rather than with his direct relation to God. We find ourselves as spiritual beings endowed with the claim of superiority to the world, and resistlessly impelled to exercise it. This experience of our own we find it impossible to account for except on the supposition of a spiritual Being who has created the world for spiritual ends, and who has put all things in subjection under man, made in His image, although we see not yet all things put under him. He is a Being, personal like ourselves, to whom we owe our life; nor can we pursue rightly and effectively the assertion of our right to hold all things subject, unless we can win His aid, as He gives it us in Christ. The Lord Jesus claims for Himself not only the dominion over the world and superiority to all its power, but also the ability to make us partakers of His victory. 'If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.' 'This is the victory that overcometh the

¹ Orr, p. 70.

² Preface to Sabatier on *The Vitality of Christian Dogma*, Engl. Trans. London, 1898, p. 11.

³ 'Christus sein Herrenrecht nur durch die moralisch wirkende Rede und die dienstfertige Handlungsweise, nicht aber durch ein Zwang rechtsgiltigen Urtheils wirksam macht' (*Unterricht*, p. 20). He refers to St. John xviii. 36, and St. Mark x. 42-5. But the latter text implies a claim of nature if the Lord chose to urge it.

world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?' We should not in any wise shrink from allowing the doctrine that religion displays itself in the first place as a victory over the world. The world meets us at our outset into life, but not with gifts voluntarily presented, but with an offer of battle; its gifts are prizes for those who compel it to yield them up; and it is only when religion is regarded as the power which gives us strength to force the world to yield its treasure that a broad and intelligent conception is gained of the range of religion. If, on the other hand, religion is regarded as in the first place the upward impulse of the individual soul, it may do great things, and has done them in the histories of Puritanism and Evangelicalism. These have made the most of the powers of individual man, and, under God, have even enabled him both to use and to resist the world, which either gives help or offers opposition to God's service. But if we place the contest with the world as our first task, this does not mean that we are ever to carry it on in our own strength. The voice of God in conscience is inseparably a part of man's equipment for his very first attempts to overcome the world. And St. John's challenge, 'Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?' is the Apostle's record of his experience that the moral nature of man imperatively cries for help in its fight with the world, and finds it in Jesus alone, who not only has had a revelation of God for Himself continued through all His life, but ever lives to help all who cry to Him and strive to repeat His own victorious example in themselves. We can understand the reaction of Ritschlianism on this point against a very narrow form of Protestantism, but not against the Catholic Church, with all its splendid history of conquest of the world in every phase of life, art, literature, and humanity, and its fidelity to nature. We should hardly suppose it possible that any Ritschlian should magnify so highly the conquests over the world which his own school has effected, considerable as they may be, as to match them with the vast conquests of the Catholic Church throughout the ages. Professor Scott effectively challenges Ritualism to compare its practical performances with those of Evangelicalism. He will not, however, be himself unwilling to remember that an immense portion of true evangelical work falls into the history of the Catholic Church, and was done not in opposition to it, but in harmony with it. The sum total of Catholic work for Christ in every quarter of the world, and every

dep
whi
whi
whi
tha
Rit
exis
nev
The
imit
can
mat
sayi
tion
be s
use
whic
this
of R
subj
fore
exp
that
(
of C
the
to H
tion
time
foun
ciple
natu
man
heigh
to R
help
of vi
part
Fath
Beh
shou
recog
hum
this

department of its activity, is immeasurably greater than that which can be attributed to any party or denomination. But while redeemed humanity enjoys in Christ all the conquests which He has made, it is only in strictest union with Him that it can claim them. To separate the Church from Him Ritschlianism offers her a bribe which in some ages of her existence she has shown herself too willing to accept, but never where the primitive freshness of her faith existed. The bribe is that of being so entirely the direct object of imitation instead of her Lord Himself, that His sayings can never be observed or realized except in her. 'The material for theology is not to be sought directly in the sayings of Christ, but rather in the corresponding representations of the original consciousness of the community.'¹ To be sure, the words of Christ were intended for reception and use by men, and the best use of them will be the use of them which the Lord intended those who hear them to make. But this may be a deceptive principle unless we keep direct hold of Himself; it will always be easier for us to realize our own subjectivity than that of the Apostles; and we shall, therefore, end in exalting our own personal reason and our modern experience above His intention in uttering them, and above that of the primitive Church in striving to carry them out.

One of the strong points of Ritschlianism is its exaltation of Christ as the centre—nay, the whole sum and substance of the revelation of God. But this loyal ascription of all things to Him is considerably weakened by the assertion that revelation of God in Christ must be viewed by His disciples in all time not from His standpoint but from theirs. 'Christ as founder of the Kingdom of God stands over against His disciples.'² But if it be an unwarranted depreciation of human nature to decline the recognition of any natural religion in man apart from Christ, it is also an unworthy view of the height to which He has raised redeemed humanity to concede to Ritschl that we are in no degree, even with all His divine help, enabled to look upon His revelation from His own point of view. It would seem to be a very distinct and very blessed part of the revelation which He makes that His Father is our Father and His God our God—He is the Son of Man. Behold what love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be the sons of God. The Catholic Creeds well recognize the solidarity of the man Christ Jesus with humanity. Their assertion of His deity enables them to do this without fear of mistake. Not so Ritschlianism, which

¹ Orr, p. 51.² *Ibid.* p. 85.

cannot tell what He was, or why that which was true of Him should not be true of other men. 'How,' said Ritschl, 'the person of Christ came to be what it is, and to possess the ethical and religious value that it does, is no object of theological investigation because the problem lies outside of every kind of investigation.' And Herrman, one of the most illustrious members of the school, declares that 'so lofty an investigation may engage the saints in glory, but for us men time is too valuable to be spent in dealing with a theme so much beyond our reach.'¹

The refusal to investigate extends in the Ritschlian opinion from the person of Christ to the nature of God's revelation to Him. Yet, if there was a revelation to Him, is it not strange that we should not somehow be able to tell what we learn from Him? Part of it may be unspeakable, like St. Paul's record of the secrets of the third heaven, because the blessings of loving intercession are difficult to express. But there must be many a lesson which has no unspeakable character, and might be spoken by the Lord, and by those who desired to pass on to others the love which they receive from Christ. But Ritschl insists that not only in Christianity, which is the supreme, but in all the inferior or imperfect revelations which have been recognized by other races than ours, 'the reception of divine revelation by the founders of religion is a mystery veiled from themselves as from us.'² But even if the reception of the revelation is a mystery, the nature of what is revealed should be communicable; it is not His secret, but that of those who heard Him. How can the missionary invite conversions if he cannot inform the converts what they are to believe? This question the Ritschlian resolves by contending that faith springs up through the mere contemplation of the Lord as He appears in the Gospels. Not only does this come true when the claims of the Gospels to be true and early records of what He was are conceded, but even in despite of listening to, nay, even of accepting the most destructive criticism.³

'Is it the case,' inquires Professor Kaftan,⁴ 'that moral action possesses the higher significance in religion?' (*i.e.* higher than knowledge); and he answers, 'So much so, that even the knowledge of God, which, of course, is never a matter of indifference, depends on whether one seeks God by obedience

¹ Quoted by Orr, p. 87 n.

² Quoted by Orr, p. 88.

³ *Ibid.* p. 91.

⁴ *Truth of the Christian Religion*, i. 92-3. A short notice of this work will be found in the *Church Quarterly Review*, xxxviii. 478.

to His commandments.' The practice of seeking knowledge first or obedience first are, according to this author, expressed by respectively the Greek idea of the Logos and the Christian idea of the kingdom of God. But, in fact, no such contrast exists between knowledge and obedience, either in Greek or in Christian language. Knowledge is the reward of obedience: 'If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.' And the Logos was not a Greek doctrine exclusively; Christians were but bound to use that wondrous language and mental power which had been so manifestly prepared for them by God as the vehicle of their preaching and the expression of their idea.

Under Ritschlian convictions the proof of Christianity rests upon a preliminary assurance derived from personal consciousness and the record and observation of humanity that man must have a religion; upon which follows an appeal to those in whom the essential longings of humanity are awake, whether the character of the Lord Jesus presented in the Gospels does not satisfy better than any other religion—nay, in the highest possible degree—the wants of our souls for a perfect helper and example. Far be it from us to depreciate this argument. But if at the same time we proclaim the surrender of miracles it is indefinitely weakened. The Christian miracles claim in common judgment to be facts; and if such miracles as the Incarnation and the Resurrection are to appeal only to the judgment of value and not to the sense of concrete fact, mankind will take that to mean that Incarnation and Resurrection would be very valuable facts, if facts they were. And the most reverential believer in the infinite value of the divine life of the Son of Man to humanity may still be forced to say that if the Lord's testimony and that of the Evangelists and Apostles to these facts were taken away, the abatement of His perfection would be very fearful. The character of Jesus, which has converted so many and sustained the faith of so many when all other supports had given way, is the character of Jesus as known through the Gospels with all the miracles about it. That is His picture as known to us; it is to that person and not another that we give the name of Jesus Christ. And if in the glory of the Lord known in the Gospels we are to make erasures and omissions, we shall be entering on a task inconsistent in its very nature with that simple confidence in the revelation of His life on which Ritschlian religion builds.

Ritschl rejects with emphasis such a doctrine as the special inspiration of the New Testament writers. Their

office, according to him, was purely historical. The revelation was to Jesus and in Jesus, and it was their lot but to record it as He had displayed it. Many readers will feel much disposed to agree in this view of the position of the New Testament. It must certainly be looked upon, not as the Revelation in Christ and His Spirit, but as a consequence of His work and that of the Spirit which followed after their Revelation was complete. Christ's life and death, with all the spiritual results that flow from them, were finished for many a year before the Gospels were compiled, and the new covenant in the Spirit was at work in the Church long before either Gospels or Epistles were written. We cannot therefore claim for the New Testament that perfection with which God must invest a Revelation of His own grace and person; but only the record of it as the men who first believed in it set it down. But we say they must have been wondrous historians if the record is to convey to us the full sense of the value of the original. To assure us of this astonishing perfection of record, they tell or imply that they possessed all human means of information of all things from the first. And not that alone; they were also the first recipients of those powers and gifts with which the Lord promised, as their story records, to endow His Church at large. And whatever effects these gifts of His have had in the Church at large they must have had in special degree in the first recipients of them, whom the Lord Himself had chosen and commissioned. There is much in the theory of Bible Inspiration which has never been defined with authority in the Church—and much patient investigation and reverent criticism must be used before the time comes for such a decision. But the doctrine that the powers by which those writers, unfurnished with accomplishments of human origin, provided the Church with such treasures of many kinds and from many pens, as the New Testament displays, demands the recognition of singular endowments on their part. The acknowledgment of these is very consistent with the belief in a continued divine assistance to the Church guarding the precious deposit committed to her for mankind—a judgment value of the New Testament of the strongest kind should be specially felt by those who regard the Church, with all her imperfection, as guided by God, and to whom a bar of total separation between the first age and those which followed seems a very unchristian imagination.

The dogma on which the thought of Ritschl chiefly centred, and in reference to which all his beliefs on the most important Christian topics were drawn out, was Justi-

fication. This was natural in a German and a hearty admirer and interpreter of Luther. In Anglican theology it can scarcely be said that justification holds the same prominence as Luther gave it. We shall not shrink from expressing the opinion that much of the Reformation theology on this point was an exaggeration or a strife about words. Acceptance with God cannot in practice be so sharply separated from moral union with Him as the doctrinal separation between justification and sanctification implied; nor yet did the faith which brings with it justification mean merely that confidence in the work of Christ in which we see so many rejoicing without much earnest self-surrender. We cannot but think that Anglican theology has in it a considerable infusion of the elements which have given such attraction to Ritschlian views on justification. Yet the two systems are by no means identical.

In the Ritschlian view God is known to us wholly as Love. And Christ is the exponent of His nature. The theories about the Atonement, which have represented the work of our Lord as done in substitution for us, have no part in the new theology. Sin does not, with Ritschl, bear the aspect of a debt which must be discharged by an equivalent which somebody must pay, but that of a display of ignorance on the part of some one who does not know what abundant pleasures exist for him in the bosom of God, and with what freedom they are attainable if his mind will but open to receive them.

The love of Jesus to God was shown in making the ends of God His own to so perfect a degree that for all practical purposes, as we have before seen, He takes the character and name of God. And the love which we can display towards God in Christ is shown in the same way by making His ends our own; and to fall in with the ends of God and accept His love, is to be justified.

We by no means refuse to the divines of the new school the right of clearing away in trenchant fashion a great deal of modern theology. Theory concerning the manner of the Lord's Atonement and the justification of man has indeed supplied too large a part of it, often to the injury of practical religion. But it is one thing to remove a mass of intellectual subtlety wasted upon mysterious subjects beyond human capacity. Man, we grant, should have confined himself to using gifts of grace freely given, instead of anatomizing the process by which they came. But it is a very different matter to tamper with the simple affirmations of divine

existence and gospel facts which the Creeds of the Church declare. The Church has never pretended to comprehend all that, in obedience to the Lord's own words and the faith of His disciples, and her own tradition she affirmed of His nature. And it is in no proud spirit of understanding things too deep for her, but in humble acceptance of what she has received, that she declines the attempt to make them acceptable by a treatment which evacuates their reality.

The Kantian theory of knowledge has introduced, in spite of its deep suggestiveness, a great deal of perplexity into the language which concerns our relation to the Divine and the Unseen. When the moral law and the creation of things are considered to be spheres alien from one another, it is as possible for a Kantian as for a Hegelian to say both that he knows God and that he knows Him not. Yet this very perplexity of language leads us earnestly to hope that many of these scholars and theologians whose principles, were we to accept them, would remove our Lord from the close presence of Him in which we live, do not remove Him from them. If in their thinking they still love Him, our faith in His Deity makes us sure that He is with them still. The imagination of men that He is not here does not make Him not to be here. We cannot but believe that many of these learned and able men are far better and far more truly Christian than their creed, could we accept it, would permit us to be.

But our own faith is that the Church of God was founded upon the supernatural facts of the Incarnation and Resurrection as truly and literally seen, touched, and handled in this world as her own life and that of her members now is. Her failures and dissensions have been great, but she has never ceased to exist and to bear witness by her very existence to the divine history in which she arose. She makes disciples of as many as she can, specially of her own children, imparting to each a share in the great inheritance, and teaching him what he has received, as soon and as well as she can get him to understand. If he knows its inestimable value it is well; but, if not, he knows it as an earthly history, to his condemnation. That is her plan of duty and happiness for herself and her members: continuing in a congenial spirit the work of the Lord Jesus, in which heavenly things and earthly met and were combined.

We must not conclude without particular acknowledgment of the merits of the English works named at the head of this article.

The work of Professor Orr is one of great care and scrupulous fairness—the opinions ascribed to Ritschl and his followers are in every case made clear by a sufficiency of direct quotations from the authors themselves. Dr. Orr also gives us much information upon the important question how far the tenets of the successors are exactly those of the eponymous leader. Many of them have taken their own line in one particular or another. And the best known to English students of them is Professor Harnack, whose work is so thoroughly his own that few would name him as a member of any party.

That Professor Harnack's principles of belief are Ritschlian no one can doubt who will read his note upon the Resurrection at vol. i. p. 85 of the *History of Dogma* (Eng. tr.): 'To believe in appearances which others have had is a frivolity which is always avenged by rising doubts.' We confess that we do not perceive the frivolity nor yet the peculiar liability to doubt of belief of this sort, provided it be duly warranted. Rather would it seem to us that the belief that the Lord had passed 'through suffering and the Cross to glory, that is to life, power, and honour,' would be liable to doubt had it not been supported by fact. We agree that 'no appearance of the Lord could permanently have convinced them of His life if they had not possessed in their hearts the impression of His Person.' But would that possession in their hearts have convinced them of His life if there had been no appearance?

The lectures of Professor Scott constitute an exceedingly valuable contribution to the study of Christian doctrine, and vindicate with great learning the claim of the Creeds of the Church to be expressions of the primitive tradition. His great subject brings him into collision with the German divines of the Ritschlian school (and especially with Harnack) who reject the supernatural views of Christian theology and the growth of the Creeds which embody it. And Dr. Scott gives us—but chiefly in the notes—a well-informed and very scathing criticism of the school which has been engaging our attention. The multiplicity and fullness of these notes make the work somewhat difficult to read, since we are constantly called away from the consideration of ancient theology in the text to the criticisms of modern theology at the foot of the page. We cannot help wishing, as we read, that the author, leaving his learned and eloquent lectures untouched, had given us a separate work upon the Ritschlian theology, which might be collected with but little trouble, and that purely of arrangement, from his notes—where one hardly knows

which most to admire, the copiousness of German theological literature upon every branch of the subject, or the mastery of it which the American author has displayed.

The work of Mr. Garvie is by far more favourable to Ritschlianism than either of those just mentioned. Indeed he ventures (p. 188) to maintain that, 'when it is said [by the Ritschlians] that Deity is predicated of Christ by a value judgment, what is meant is not that Christ is merely imagined God, but that the evidence of His Divinity is such that it can be appreciated only by one who has a personal relation of faith to Christ.' It requires considerable courage to defend such an assertion in the face not only of the numerous passages from leading writers of the school which are adduced by the other authors on our list, but even of many against which Mr. Garvie himself enters protest. On the other hand, both Professor Orr and Professor Scott give to the Ritschlian school an amount of praise for its good work in the Church of God which might seem hardly consistent with the fatal surrenders of Christian fact of which they have convicted it.

'We can readily recognize,' says Professor Orr,¹ 'the many true thoughts which lie in the Ritschlian system, and the relative value of many of its characteristic contentions. It is true that religion has often suffered from the intrusions of philosophy: true that over-intellectualism and the substitution of scholastic subtlety and elaboration for conceptions drawn from immediate contact with the Gospel facts and from direct Christian experience have been a bane and hindrance to the right apprehension of Christian truth. So far as Ritschlianism is a protest against this rationalizing of Christianity and an assertion of the right and duty of developing the Christian system from its own basis, its influence is wholesome.'

The passage continues by enumerating some of the actual services of the school to theology, among which we read with much satisfaction, on Professor Orr's high authority,

'the note of return to positive Revelation in Christ sounded by the school, and the tendencies to a fuller confession both of the Deity of Christ and of His work of atonement, which are increasingly developing themselves.'

Professor Scott is more severe, especially upon Harnack. Yet he offers the following testimony to Ritschl:

'He opposed the extreme positions of Baur. He called men to leave philosophy and study the Scriptures. He defended the Apostolicity of most of the New Testament books. He placed Christ and

¹ *Ritschlian Theology*, p. 232.

the Revelation in Him, in the centre of all theology. He pointed to the importance of Christ's teaching of religion as a holy kingdom of Heaven. He laid great stress upon Christian living. There are also many single truths which Ritschl presents that are very important. Some of them are : the aim of Justification is the begetting of true morality : faith in justification makes us free rulers over all things : the certainty of reconciliation through Christ must precede joyous faith in the paternal providence of God : the idea of the kingdom of God is made prominent, also of the Church in contrast to all individualistic piety : faith preserves its power not in renouncing the world but in a sound rule over the world.¹

These are considerable services to the evangelical faith on behalf of which both these able critics plead ; but they feel that the services are counterbalanced by larger defects, some of which actually consist in the extremes to which these same meritorious principles are pushed. When begetting of true morality is put forward as the aim of justification : when the idea of the Church is made prominent in contrast to all individualistic piety—it should strike these critics that perhaps some gaps and failures in the teaching of their own school have left opportunity to these new doctors to bring forward truths which Evangelicalism often forgets. We should be sorry indeed to give any offence where we feel great agreement and are sensible of great service rendered ; but we have much acquaintance with Evangelicalism in our own Church, and we have known in our experience of it that personal conversion often filled the place of evidence ; and while, to be sure, no formal doubt of the historical character of Christ's life in any part was allowed, the whole religious life became so much one of feeling as to suggest to us the conviction that the loss would scarce have been felt if the spiritual system as an object of faith had displaced the historical belief.

Both the Ritschlians and their critics use the word Catholic simply as equivalent to Romanist, and a term of reproach. It means for them a religion of externals and of tyranny, in which conscience submits to constraint, and nothing in the Gospel is individually grasped or known. But there is a different kind of catholicity from this : in which the sense of God's promised guidance to the Church comes as a help to individual faith, and a sympathetic aid to individual knowledge, which it is as vain to accuse of mental tyranny or compulsion as it would be to stigmatise in the same terms the strong and tender guidance of a mother. The Ritschlian position which regards Holy Scripture as the record of Revela-

¹ *The Nicene Theology*, p. 315.

tion made in Christ rather than a revelation in itself, seems to be willingly received by these writers as one of the points in which Ritschl has done service, and a welcome change from the old view in which an infallible Bible stood separated from the discovery in it of the true Gospel at the Reformation by the great gulf of near two thousand years. But the case presents itself more reasonably to those who have been taught to say with reality and earnestness, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.' The history of the Church with all its defects is the continuation of Scripture times, and full of the presence of Christ. It is, we must confess, in a strongly Protestant Church that we can most easily imagine the rise of such a school as that of Ritschl, in which belief in the Incarnation of God in the flesh becomes the mere expression of a judgment of value. When Professor Scott traces the history of the Creeds and claims for every article the attestation of Scriptural authority, he at the same time maintains and proves by an excellent *catena patrum* the Catholic tradition which side by side with Scripture bore witness to the truth. We accept with gratitude the valuable teaching of these volumes, and admire the familiarity of their authors with the copious literature of Germany, of which so many among ourselves are very ignorant; yet we cannot but feel that the Church of England occupies a better position than theirs, both for accepting the good which Ritschlianism can offer and for reproving its faults. For we can look back through the long vista of Catholic tradition in a Church which claims to have been founded by the Lord Himself to testify to the reality of His nature, divine and human, and to use His sacramental gifts. Our forefathers in Reformation times never had to cast away the existing form of Church constitution, and to fetch up another from the depths of long ago with a claim to be a pure reproduction of an Apostolic model lost for fourteen centuries. And our theology, whatever its mistakes and defects, has never been so intellectualized or so carnalized as to hinder us from seeing in our Founder not merely the judgment of the value of God in human form, but the actual Incarnate God who possesses the value of Son of God because He is really such, and the value of a Saviour risen from the dead because He rose indeed.

ART. III.—WILLIAM MORRIS.

The Life of William Morris. By J. W. MACKAIL. Two vols. New impression. (London, 1899.)

So far as a contemporary can judge, one of the most marked features of the second half of the nineteenth century, as distinguished from the first, is the revived sense and appreciation of the beautiful—the *τὸ καλὸν* of the Greeks—in all departments of life. The early Victorian and late Georgian era was emphatically the reign of ugliness. The most loyal *laudator temporis acti* will hardly deny that in our idea of what is beautiful—in painting, in architecture, in furniture, in dress; in fact, in everything which appeals to the outward eye—we have wonderfully advanced since the days of our fathers and our grandfathers; and, while many causes have contributed to this result, none have been more potent than the efforts of a few gifted men, who, undaunted by ridicule, misunderstanding, and prejudice, persisted in recommending and carrying out the ideal they had formed. In this little group the names of John Ruskin, Dante Gabriele Rossetti, Holman Hunt, Ford Madox Brown, Edward Burne-Jones, and William Morris stand pre-eminent; and it is with the last, but not the least, of these names that the volumes before us have to do.

One often hears the complaint that modern biographies are too long, but it is difficult to see how the present biography could have been shortened without distinct loss; for never was there so full and varied a life as that of William Morris. Poet, painter, architect, designer, decorator, dyer, weaver, upholsterer, prose romancer, pamphleteer, translator, editor, publisher, printer, lecturer (not to say agitator), one is almost dazzled by the number of characters in which he appears; and the curious part is that they were not so many detached *rôles* which he played at different periods, but all closely connected one with another and forming one harmonious whole, combined in the very striking personality of William Morris.

✱ In reviewing a book the hero of which laid so much stress upon education through the eye of sense we turn first, as in duty bound, to its outward appearance; and even before we open it we are struck with its binding, in a beautiful subdued colour, and with the artistic design on the back of the cover, which is one of Morris's own borders. Then, when it is

opened, we are struck with the clear, bold, mediæval type, which is worthy of Morris's own press at Kelmscott; and then with the exquisite illustrations from the drawings of Mr. E. H. New. It would be little less than sacrilege to present to the public a Life of William Morris in any form but the best; but none the less ought we to be grateful to Mr. Mackail and to all who have been concerned for presenting it to us in the very best.

The matter of the book is worthy of its form. Mr. Mackail himself writes in a clear, scholarly style, and never once grates upon one by bad taste. The many extracts from Morris's own correspondence and writings are eminently readable, and give scope for those descriptive powers in which he excelled. There is a touching pathos in the few passages (we wish there were more) written by the most faithful and sympathetic of all his friends, Sir Edward Burne-Jones; and perhaps the best part of all, so far as style and thought go, is that which contains the reminiscences of Canon Dixon, whose practised pen displays the same grace and vigour when it is employed in sketching the writer's dead friend as when it is employed in sketching the eminent English Churchmen of the sixteenth century.

Let us now turn from the book to the subject of it. William Morris was trained from his infancy in that love of nature which was one of his leading passions through life. He was born March 24, 1834, in the neighbourhood of Epping Forest, which has now happily been secured for ever for the benefit of those 'masses' in whom he took so deep and unselfish an interest, and for whom he probably sacrificed his life. There is, of course, grander scenery elsewhere in England, but it may be doubted whether there is any which is more refreshing, more homely, and which grows upon one more than that part of Essex which lies within ten miles of the heart of smoky London. Morris loved Epping Forest to his dying day. 'I was born,' he writes in his declining years, 'and bred in its neighbourhood, and when I was a boy and young man knew it yard by yard from Wanstead to the Theydons, and from Hale End to the Fairlop Oak. . . . It has a peculiar charm of its own not to be found in any other forest' (i. 7). In this estimate we cordially agree; and it is no drawback, but rather the reverse, to us, as we are sure it would be to him, that the Forest, instead of being left to the wild solitudes of nature, is haunted by toilers from the city who have snatched an hour or two to breathe its fresh, pure air, which

is remarkably bracing, or by waggon-loads of happy school-children who have been sent by the charitable to spend a day or half a day in the country. Like the Vicar of Wakefield, all whose migrations were from the blue bed to the brown, William Morris's only migration in his childhood was from one part of the forest to the other—from Elm House, Walthamstow, where he was born, to Woodford Hall, whither the family removed when the father's business in the city prospered. He was a precocious boy, for he was 'deep in the *Waverleys* at four' (i. 5), and at seven had 'read them all, and many of the *Marryats*'—fine, wholesome, manly reading for a country-bred lad. The religion of the family is happily described by Mr. Mackail as being 'of the normal type of a somewhat sterile Evangelicalism, which cursorily dismissed everything outside itself as Popery on the one hand or Dissent on the other' (i. 10), a description which would probably apply to the religion of a vast majority of the upper-middle class of the period, and which really meant that it was nothing in particular. We can therefore well understand that when Morris was sent in 1848 to Marlborough he should be impressed by the Church teaching and attractive services in the college chapel; for Marlborough, though not so advanced as Radley or the Woodard schools, was still founded as a distinctively Church school, with a preference to sons of clergymen. His biographer tells us that the influence of the Anglo-Catholic movement now came for the first time into his life (i. 17); but it seems to us that this was the case only in a very modified degree, for Marlborough was not what would then be called a Puseyite school, and, such as it was, Morris never entered into the spirit of the place. Marlborough was then very different from what it soon afterwards became under Cotton and Bradley; it did not really make Morris either a good scholar or a good Churchman; its chief attraction to him was its nearness to scenery which slightly reminded him of his home. 'A childhood on the skirts of Epping Forest was fitly followed by a boyhood on the edge of Savernake' (i. 15). The next change might, if it had had time, have brought to bear upon him a far more potent religious influence. So limited were his attainments at Marlborough that he had to be 'coached' in order to reach the very humble standard of a matriculation examination in a pass college at Oxford, and the coach that carried him safely through the ordeal was F. B. Guy, then a young assistant master at the Forest School, Walthamstow. Guy was a good scholar and an excellent Churchman of a fine robust type.

VOL. LI.—NO. CI.

E

His influence over his pupil was great, and in late years Morris kept up a cordial friendship with him (i. 25). But the relationship of tutor and pupil hardly lasted a year, and that time would be mainly occupied with the rudiments of classics and mathematics, so this influence could not probably count for much.

In June 1852 Morris went up for examination at Exeter College, when there 'sat next him another boy who had come up for the same purpose from King Edward's School, Birmingham, and was destined to be his most intimate and lifelong friend, Edward Burne-Jones' (i. 27). Morris's undergraduate life, like his school life, was not distinguished, and gave no promise of his future eminence. Indeed, he received even less direct benefit from his Oxford than from his Marlborough training. But on this point we must dwell more at length, for we are inclined to think that his biographer's account may tend to give a false impression on a matter of vital importance. That impression is, that the Oxford Movement deeply affected Morris and his friend Burne-Jones for a time, but so entirely failed to affect them permanently that before their undergraduate days were ended they abandoned the object for which they had been sent to Oxford, viz. to prepare for receiving Holy Orders, and that in their third year 'art and literature were no longer thought of as hand-maids to religion, but as ends to be pursued for their own sake' (i. 62).

Now the facts are of course unquestioned; they *did* go up to Oxford with the intention of taking Holy Orders; they *did* become, in a sense, 'high Churchmen,' so 'high' that they almost toppled over and fell on the Roman side. Morris at one time thought of setting up a monastery, or *μόνη*, after the fashion of Newman at Littlemore; and then, no doubt, a reaction *did* set in, and they lost their churchmanship, such as it was, and, we fear, never regained it. But that their course was in any way a logical or legitimate outcome of the Anglo-Catholic movement, or that they were ever really under the influence of that movement, we very much doubt. In fact, we do not see how they *could* have been; for Oxford in the fifties was a place where the movement thrived less than in any place we know. Perhaps at Exeter College, more than elsewhere, there was a sort of superficial survival of its force; for Exeter, through its connexion with William Sewell, received recruits from Radley, which was an offspring of the movement and preserved its traditions. Exeter also was patronized by Bishop Wilberforce, who was to a certain

extent an Anglo-Catholic; but all who knew intimately Oxford in general, and Exeter College in particular, during the fifties, can hardly hear without a smile that thoughtful and earnest young men were really confirmed in their Anglo-Catholicism there. The Exeter men were, as a rule, a gentlemanly, well-dressed, not over-scholarly set, devotedly attached to athletics; the Exeter boat was always high on the river; the Exeter eleven did well in the cricket field; but, with a few brilliant exceptions, the men did *not* do well in the schools. Let any one—remembering that Exeter was, for that day, a very large college, with more than 120 undergraduates—consult the Class Lists, and he will be able to verify this for himself. An Exeter commoner would be the last man to receive any intellectual or spiritual development; and we can well understand the bitter complaints of Morris on the subject. The real influence which Oxford had upon him was not from his college, either from the dons or from his brother-undergraduates, but from what the outer world would call a *coterie*, but what was called by the members 'the Set,' and afterwards 'the Brotherhood,' the majority of whom were out-college men. This 'Brotherhood' is so admirably described by Canon Dixon, who belonged to it, that we must be content to refer the reader to his long description.¹ Their intellectual tastes were very much the same as those of other thoughtful undergraduates in that day. They were devoted to poetry, and Tennyson was their *magnus Apollo*; they were much interested in art, and took Ruskin for their guide; they had ideas about philosophy and general literature, and on these subjects were more or less the disciples of Carlyle or of Kingsley. But as for theology or religion they had, so far as our recollection serves, no guide at all. Charles Marriott, the last of the great leaders who influenced undergraduates, broke down and left Oxford just about the time when Morris came up; Keble was far away at Hursley; and Pusey was but a dim figure, to be regarded indeed with awe and reverence, but as far apart from the ordinary undergraduate's life as if he too had been at Hursley instead of Christ Church. Liddon, King, Bright, Mozley had not yet come to the front, and there was really no one of commanding influence in a Church direction. This ought to be carefully taken into account when we estimate the Oxford career of Morris. Oxford did not do justice to him; but he also did not do justice to Oxford. 'No one,' he says, 'tried to teach me, and I did not try to learn.' This may be true

¹ See *Life*, i. 42-7.

enough in his case, but it does not apply generally—no, nor even to all his friends; Faulkner and Dixon would hardly have said the same, nor would his old tutor, Guy, who had been trained under the powerful intellect of Mark Pattison. If he had stepped across the road, and asked his brother-poet and namesake, 'Morris of Jesus,' he would have heard, we fancy, a different tale; and so he would if he had turned a few yards to the left and inquired at Lincoln, or a few more yards to the right and inquired at Trinity, or, a few yards further, at Balliol. The Oxford of the fifties, which trained such brilliant scholars as Robinson Ellis, Charles Bowen, William Newman, W. W. Merry, F. St. John Thackeray, Edward Wickham, and men of such intellectual power generally as George Goschen, Godfrey Lushington, T. Green, T. Fowler, Horace Davey, John Morley, J. C. Morison—one hardly knows where to stop—was not to be despised as a place of mental training. It is freely admitted that Oxford was not profitable, in that sense, to Burne-Jones or William Morris; but is it quite fair to throw the whole blame of the failure upon Oxford? A young man may be a genius, but if 'his soul is like a star and dwells apart'—if he does not throw himself at all into the life and spirit of the place, is it likely that he will receive much benefit from it?

But to return to facts. Burne-Jones and William Morris agreed that art was the only thing worth living for, and that the former should aim at being a painter and the latter an architect. So in 1855, having passed his final examination, Morris was articled to Mr. Street, who was then residing, as an architect, at Oxford. In 1856 Mr. Street removed to London, taking his pupil with him. But meanwhile Morris had become acquainted with Dante Gabriele Rossetti, and this brought about another change in his career. Rossetti thought a painter's life the noblest of all lives, and persuaded Morris to give up architecture and take to painting. For the next two years he lived with Burne-Jones in Red Lion Square, and devoted himself with all the enthusiasm of his nature to his new calling, spending his holidays in the Zoological Gardens to study the animals there for painting purposes. He sympathized heart and soul with the ideas of the new school of Pre-Raphaelites; and it was at this time that, in conjunction with Burne-Jones and others, he undertook that work, so familiar to the older generation of Oxford men, of painting the walls of the Union. In 1859 he made a happy marriage with Miss Jane Burdon, whose face is well known to the many admirers of Sir E. Burne-Jones's pictures,

his old friend Dixon being called in to perform the ceremony at the oldest of the Oxford churches, St. Michael's.

But Morris had not found his true forte when he took to painting; he was nearer doing so when he determined to build a country-house for himself and his newly-married wife. The spot fixed upon was on Bexley Heath, near Upton, in North Kent; it was built in the middle of an orchard, 'so that it should have apple and cherry trees all round it from the first' (i. 140); and it was to be called 'the Red House' to distinguish it by its very name from the stucco and slate which abounded in the district, and which were always his special abhorrence. After the building came the furnishing; and this suggested to him the work which has had even more to do with making his name famous than 'The Earthly Paradise' has. The correctness and fastidiousness of his tastes rendered it impossible for him to purchase any scrap of furniture which would suit him. He had to design it all, down to the minutest article. 'Not a chair, or table, or bed; not a cloth or paper-hanging for the walls; nor tiles to line fire-places or passages; nor a curtain or a candlestick; nor a jug to hold wine or a glass to drink it out of, but had to be re-invented, one might almost say, to escape the flat ugliness of the current article' (i. 143).

This furnishing of the new house led to the establishment in 1861 of the firm of 'Morris, Marshall, Faulkner, and Co.,' which is described in the prospectus as formed for the production of: '(1) mural decoration, either in pictures or in pattern-work, or merely in the arrangement of colour, as applied to dwelling-houses, churches, or public buildings; (2) carving generally, as applied to architecture; (3) stained glass, especially with reference to its harmony with mural decoration; (4) metal-work in all its branches, including jewellery; (5) furniture, either depending for its beauty on its own design, on the application of materials hitherto overlooked, or on its conjunction with figure and pattern-painting. Under this head is included embroidery of all kinds, stamped leather, and ornamental work in other such materials, besides every article necessary for domestic use' (i. 151-2).

In sending the prospectus to his friend Guy, he says: 'I have started as a decorator, which I have long meant to do when I could get men of reputation to join me, and to this end mainly I have built my fine house. We are, or consider ourselves to be, the only really artistic firm of the kind' (i. 149). Such an undertaking required capital, which it was

not very easy to find. Morris was the only member of the firm (they were eight in number) who was at all well-to-do; he advanced all he could, and just staved off financial ruin. But the spread of 'æstheticism' and 'ritualism' (one *must* adopt the popular terms, absurd though they are) created a want which the firm was well able to supply. Orders came in, especially 'for church decoration in the form of wall-painting, embroideries, or hangings, altar-cloths, stained-glass windows, and floor-tiles' (i. 162). The business increased so rapidly that in 1865 Morris, in order to be always on the spot, was forced to give up the beautiful country home of his own creating, and settle again in London, in the uncongenial quarter of Queen Square, Bloomsbury, to which the business of the firm was transferred from Red Lion Square; but so dear was the Red House to him that he could never set eyes on it again, confessing that the sight of it would be more than he could bear (i. 168).

All these business arrangements, however, did not interfere with his intellectual work. 'If,' he once said, 'a chap can't compose an epic poem while he's weaving tapestry, he had better shut up, he'll never do any good at all' (i. 186); and he acted up to his principles. In 1867, when the business of the firm was nearly at its height, appeared 'The Life and Death of Jason,' the first of his great poems which was a real success. Canon Dixon, a poet himself and a very competent authority, ranks it higher even than the 'The Earthly Paradise.' That is not the general verdict, but 'Jason' was warmly received, and Morris was encouraged to go on with his poetical work, which had been in abeyance since the comparative failure of its predecessor, 'The Defence of Guinevere.' Morris wrote it more *con amore*; for the Arthurian legend never really took hold of him as it took hold of Tennyson, whereas the subjects of the Greek and Latin classics did, though he was never a great classical scholar in the technical sense. Quickly following the 'Jason' came what, *pace* Canon Dixon, we must venture to pronounce his *magnum opus*, 'The Earthly Paradise'—*magnum* in every sense of the word, for it contained more than forty-two thousand lines. The first volume, containing Parts I. and II., appeared in 1868; the second, containing Part III., in 1869; and the third, containing Part IV., in 1870. It consisted of twenty-four tales, and it was as a narrative poet that Morris was in his true element. Chaucer was his model, indeed his 'master,' as he repeatedly confesses, both in the beautiful lines from the 'Jason,' and the no less beautiful *envoi* to

'The Earthly Paradise,' which are quoted by Mr. Mackail (i. 198-9).

Perhaps the success of his poems encouraged Morris, who was never satisfied with an exclusively town life, to take the beautiful old manor-house at Kelmscott, which stands on the Oxfordshire side of the Upper Thames, near Lechlade, thirty miles from Oxford by river. With Kelmscott, more than with any other place, is associated the name of William Morris; and Mr. Mackail has been well-advised in inserting no less than ten illustrations in which Kelmscott appears. The house was at first taken in joint tenancy with Rossetti; but the partnership was not a success. Though Rossetti had at one time more influence than anyone else over Morris, and was in fact the proximate cause of the change in his career, he was never to Morris what Burne-Jones always was, and what, in a rather different way, Faulkner was. The latter was his invariable travelling companion, and in 1871 the two made a long tour in Iceland. The chief charm of Iceland to Morris was that it was the land of tales; the Northern sagas appealed to the narrative poet even more than the classical legends did. This tour is described by Mr. Mackail at great length, and if in any future edition it should be thought desirable to shorten the work, this perhaps is the part to which the pruning-knife might be first applied. At any rate, the tour need not detain us now.

On his return to England Morris resumed the work of illuminating books, a work in which he took great delight, and was eminently successful; and in 1872 he published what his biographer considers in some respects 'much the most remarkable of his longer poems' (i. 281). It was entitled 'Love is Enough,' and is a sort of drama, or rather masque, like the poetry of those mediæval times which Morris loved, before the advent of that Renaissance which Morris hated.

It was probably this hatred of the Renaissance which made his first visit to Italy, undertaken in 1873, a doubtful success. As Morris was emphatically an artist, and Italy is emphatically the home of art, it might have been expected that when there he would have been in the seventh heaven. But it was not so. Even Florence did not entirely satisfy him. He very much preferred Northern France, and also Iceland; and to the latter place, in the same year, he made a second tour, of course accompanied by his friend Faulkner, which, unlike most second tours, was as successful as the first.

Meanwhile the work of the firm was still progressing, and the workshops in Queen Square were encroaching so much upon the living part of the house that Morris was obliged to change his town residence, and he lived for six years (1873-9), when he was not at Kelmscott, in a house between Hammersmith and Turnham Green. But trouble was at hand. Artists and poets are not the best men of business, and complications arose which led to the dissolution of the firm in 1875. This produced a temporary misunderstanding with Madox Brown, one of its originators, and a final break-up of the attachment between Morris and Rossetti. Burne-Jones and Faulkner, who had also been partners, were as friendly as ever, and Burne-Jones still continued to render his invaluable artistic aid. But the business was now carried on by Morris alone, who, so far from being disheartened, worked at it more vigorously than ever. He learnt the arts of dyeing and weaving, and worked assiduously at the lost art of indigo dyeing (i. 317). In time the dyeing and calico printing at Leek in Staffordshire became a most important part of the business, and the designing of patterns for chintzes and figured silks became part of his daily work (i. 351). He opened sale- and show-rooms at the corner of Oxford Street and North Audley Street, and, having taken a house in the Upper Mall at Hammersmith, had a tapestry-loom in his bedroom, where he worked at weaving and dyeing.

He was equally active during the same period with his head as with his hands. In 1875 he appeared as a translator, publishing 'Three Northern Love Stories,' translated from the Icelandic, a performance on which he might safely defy the critics, who are not, as a rule, familiar with the Icelandic tongue; but in the same year he produced another translation, which might well have made him fear their lash. This was a verse translation of Virgil's 'Æneid,' and it was followed some years later by another verse translation of Homer's 'Odyssey.' These translations seem to us the boldest works which even this bold man ever undertook. He was not a finished scholar, and he challenged comparison with scholars who were finished in the highest possible degree, such as John Conington, Charles Bowen, and Philip Worsley. But, wonderful to relate, his translations were neither of them failures; if he was not a scholar, he was a poet, and could perhaps better appreciate true poetry than better scholars could. In 1876 appeared another poem, 'Sigurd the Volsung,' in which he told 'the Great Story of the North'—that is, the Icelandic Saga—which should be to all our race what

the Tale of Troy was to the Greeks.' He did not, however, succeed in interesting the English in the Story of the North as Homer succeeded in interesting the Greeks in the Tale of Troy, and the poem fell rather flat.

As if he had not sufficient irons in the fire at this most wonderfully active period, he began to take a far more prominent part in public matters than he had ever done before. He helped to form the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, and was its life and soul for several years, his artist's eye being offended at the havoc that was going on under the name of restoration. He plunged into the troubled sea of politics, became in 1877 treasurer of the Eastern Question Association, and protested vehemently against the war with Russia, which was then thought to be imminent. He was coming more to the front in every way. His artistic merits began to be more widely known. In 1880 there was a public exhibition of the now famous Hammersmith rugs and carpets (ii. 4), and he became a regular visitor and adviser at South Kensington (ii. 7). In 1881 he was engaged in decorations on an extensive scale at St. James's Palace (ii. 30), and his business so increased that he set up fresh workshops at Merton in Surrey. In 1882 his old college at Oxford awoke to the fact that it had had a genius as its inmate and knew him not; he was elected honorary fellow of Exeter.

It would, we think, have been better if he had adhered to poetry and art, in both of which he excelled; in fact, if he had been exclusively what he was sometimes snobbishly called in derision 'the poet upholsterer,' 'the poet who kept a shop.' It was a perfectly correct designation, and a most honourable one, of which no real gentleman need be ashamed. But he, unhappily we think, travelled outside it. True poets and true artists are not plentiful as blackberries; but Morris was both, and we *do* grudge the time and labour which in his later years he diverted from what were his two proper spheres. By all means, let him have been 'a retail tradesman'; that was all part of his work as an artist; but it was a pity that he began to write prose, whether prose romances or tracts and pamphlets, instead of verse; and a still greater pity that he became almost entirely absorbed for a time in social and political questions. But his ardent and unselfish nature led him to sympathize deeply with the hard lot of the poor: he thought they could never rise to a higher level until the whole framework of society was remodelled, and so he became an open and declared socialist, joined the Democratic Federation

in 1880 (ii. 114), went about lecturing in all parts, sometimes in the open air, sometimes in close, stuffy rooms, and, in fact, made this his most serious occupation (ii. 123). But it must not be supposed that this new phase was unconnected with his art; it flowed naturally from it. What stirred him most of all was that the masses, amid their squalid surroundings, could not possibly learn to appreciate the Beautiful; and with Morris the Beautiful was all but synonymous with the Good and the Happy; at any rate, all three were inextricably blended in his mind, and also in his practical endeavours to ameliorate the condition of the masses. He met with many difficulties and discouragements. Internal jealousies and divergent aims caused a split in the Democratic Federation, and Morris joined the seceding party who formed the Socialist League, and spent a large amount of money, as well as of time and energy, in its affairs. Then he found to his disgust that some who called themselves Socialists were really Anarchists, and Morris never meant anarchy. But we pass lightly over this part of his career, because we think it was a mistake, though a mistake which arose from the purest motives, and was persisted in with a most generous spirit. It was a mistake, too, which helped to shorten his days; he had long been doing the work of ten men, but this last strain was too much for him. He died, at the age of sixty-three, on October 3, 1896.

Mr. Mackail twice compares William Morris with Dr. Johnson, and the points of resemblance between these two remarkable men are obvious enough; but so also are the points of difference, and one of these we feel bound in conclusion to notice. Dr. Johnson had always from first to last a very firm grasp of revealed religion, and never once swerved from his position as a staunch English Churchman of the old-fashioned type. We doubt whether Morris, even in his Anglo-Catholic days, ever had so firm a grasp, and about his later views we are left in considerable doubt. But he never wrote, so far as we can remember, a single line, either in prose or verse, which was of an irreligious or immoral tendency. He was estimable in every relation of life—a good son, a good husband, a good father, and a good friend; in short, one to be esteemed for his character no less than to be admired for his genius; and we heartily commend to our readers the very attractive portrait which Mr. Mackail has given us of a very attractive man.

ART. IV.—PRINCIPAL CAIRD'S 'FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF CHRISTIANITY.'

The Fundamental Ideas of Christianity. The Gifford Lectures on Natural Theology, delivered to the University of Glasgow in Sessions, 1892-3 and 1895-6. By JOHN CAIRD, D.D., LL.D., late Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Glasgow. With a Memoir by EDWARD CAIRD, D.C.L., LL.D., Master of Balliol. Two Volumes. (Glasgow, 1899.)

THE writer of the present article a few years ago fell into conversation with a representative of Natural Science at one of the Scotch universities, upon the subject of Gifford Lectures. His companion, after expressing eager expectations of a course of such lectures in the near future from a leading English physiologist, with whose views upon the problems of Natural Theology he especially wished to become acquainted, went on to lament that the lectureships were so frequently sought and obtained by ministers of religion, and that the man of Science with an interest in speculative theology was consequently often only able to hear discourses upon the doctrines of the Christian Church. Whether or not an accurate statement of fact, this remark seemed to be noteworthy because it expressed a feeling which is perhaps widely prevalent among educated people. The religious philosophy of Buddhism, the myths and religious ritual of savage races, or the system of a modern second-rate philosopher, would often be acknowledged to be an interesting subject for a valuable course of lectures such as those which the Gifford foundation provides, while the presentation of the religion of Christendom, in its philosophical aspects and in philosophical dress, would at the same time be resented as an intrusion of the pulpit. Yet to that considerable class of people who may be said to live, intellectually, on or near the margin of the Christian Church, such a series of lectures should be at least as full of interest, one would think, as to persons actually living by its Creed. This, the culmination of all historic religions, might surely be expected to contribute something towards the solution of the problems of man's origin and destiny, even by those who are unable to regard it, with us, as the one solution that is absolute.

The series of Gifford Lectures before us constitute such a presentation of Christianity as this. They endeavour, that is

to say, to interpret some of the fundamental ideas involved in the Christian Faith by means of Philosophy. And it may be hoped, and sanguinely expected, that they will be studied by the class of readers to whom we have above referred. For their author, though known chiefly as a theologian and a pre-eminently great preacher, had also acquired considerable reputation as a philosopher by his work on *Spinoza* and his *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*. He was certainly one of the best fitted in our time to present Christianity reasonably to reasonable men.

Principal Caird's *Lectures* are enhanced in value by being prefaced with a lengthy memoir from the pen of his brother, the Master of Balliol. We are grateful for this memoir as a beautiful and simple picture of a strong and pure-souled man as well as of a deep and absolutely honest thinker. We are also grateful for the light which it throws upon the development of much that is characteristic in the Principal's teaching offered to us in the present work. We are shown that some of his thought was called out by the external circumstances of his life, his environment and studies; while much was evolved from ideas which may be said to have been innate in him. The negative influence of what developed into Manselism, prevalent in Scotland in the earlier part of Dr. Caird's life in consequence of Sir W. Hamilton's occupation of a chair in Philosophy, and the positive influence of Hegel, were two of the most important factors which shaped Dr. Caird's most characteristic views, and determined for him his field of thought. We also gather from the memoir that Dr. Caird never passed through any phase of scepticism, philosophical or religious: a fact which might have been inferred from the internal evidence of the work itself which we are about to discuss. 'His life as a pastor and preacher,' we read (p. lxvi), 'had given him a deep and . . . unshakable conviction of the general truth of the Christian view of life, of its adaptation to human nature, and of its supplying a key to the practical difficulties of human experience.' Thus belief was natural and easy to him beyond the limit up to which his philosophy could rationalize and logically justify it. It was on this account, rather than that he had been under the necessity of wrestling his way through difficulties and doubts to the full acceptance of the Christian Faith, that he was so completely emancipated, from the first, from any fear of reason, and from all doubts that criticism of any kind could ever be fatal to aught else than the excrescences of Christian doctrine or the foreign and alien elements

which it had absorbed during its expansion and development. Confidence in the beliefs in which he had always been at home, rather than conviction sought and found with effort, was the basis of his fearlessly critical habit of mind. And his confidence and fearlessness were a source of powerful inspiration to others. The influence of Caird has probably been at least as great as that of any modern divine in his own country; and indeed it is not difficult to find obvious traces of it upon some of the best thinkers in our own communion. No one can turn from the sermons and essays of the late Canon Aubrey Moore, for instance, to the works of Principal Caird, without seeing at once that the active and brilliant mind of the English thinker was stimulated and fertilized by the writings and whole mental attitude of the great Scotchman. To one whose knowledge of this Oxford theologian is derived solely from his writings, it would seem that Principal Caird's influence was one of the most powerful which affected the bent of his mind, and determined the directions which its activities pursued.

The Anglican Churchman owes much, then, to Dr. Caird. To him, perhaps, as much as to any single individual, must be traced the stimulus to a form of theological labour, whereof there have been but scanty signs as yet in the English Church, which is one of the most pressing calls of our time. We mean the work of undertaking in Theology what, in another field, was called by Kant a 'critical regress': an examination, that is, of the origin and validity of the fundamental concepts of Christianity, the limits of theological knowledge, and the rational basis of religious faith. To workers in a science such as that of Theology there is a very natural temptation to allow the legitimate desire for detailed completeness in knowledge of spiritual things to pass over into the will to know too much and too definitely; to become more concerned with the completion and beautifying of the edifice than with putting beyond doubt the stability of its foundations; to engage too exclusively in the drawing of inferences when more attention might advantageously be given to the critical sifting of premises; to use principles whose validity has never been estimated, and to build on assumptions only partially recognised to be assumptions. Yet this is an age which is nervously sensible of its being an age of criticism, and in which the deductive method is becoming more and more unsatisfying to innumerable men and women eagerly desirous of religious truth and deeply interested in theological thought. It is a good thing at any time and for any Church, and it

would be an especially good thing at this time within our own Church, for some of its best thinkers to be disturbed with that unrest which urges to the search for the absolute foundations of religious faith. There is a need to trace the scientific frontier between belief and knowledge, or, as we should prefer to say, to decide where theology appeals to the standard of the pure, and where to the standard of the practical, reason. For there is a widespread vague suspicion abroad that faith starts from somewhere in the air and is distinct, not only in degree but also in kind, from knowledge; and the consequence is a distrust of dogmatic theology as requiring assent to propositions which are not self-evident, and yet for which adequate proof cannot be supplied. The demand 'prove all things' is very often felt even where it is not actually expressed; and it is a demand so healthy, so deserving of all encouragement and respect, that it lays upon the Church of Him who is the Way and the Truth the great responsibility of undertaking not only the enlargement of the body of theological knowledge, but also the illumination of the nature of the processes by which we obtain it, and the keeping of them free from error.

We are thus prepared to welcome very heartily a work such as Principal Caird's *Gifford Lectures*. It is an attempt to estimate the validity, according to the canons of the understanding, of some of the leading ideas of the Christian Faith. Whether the book has always succeeded in furnishing a rational justification for such ideas over and above their moral and religious basis, and whether the author has accomplished his object of carrying his philosophy into all the ground occupied by his faith, are questions which we shall endeavour to answer as we pass in review his treatment of the several subjects with which he deals.

We may still delay doing so for a moment in order to say a word with regard to the literary value of Dr. Caird's work and of the spirit in which it is written. The book is obviously the product of a deep religious experience. Self-knowledge and knowledge of men, reverence and fervent piety, moral earnestness and spirituality, mark these lectures from first to last. Religion, for their author, is not the impersonal and academic thing to which it has sometimes been reduced in works of a similar kind; it is intensely personal and practical, and the Principal's noble thought and feeling find natural and dignified expression in language worthy of the subject-matter. Dr. Caird's eloquence, however, is well known to be scarcely rivalled. It is far removed indeed from the hollow

roll of sonorous adjectives which sometimes furnishes a musical accompaniment to mediocrity of thought. His style is at once graceful and stately, enthusiastic and yet rigorously chastened and controlled. Though it was his eloquence which largely gained for Dr. Caird his influence over others, we learn from his brother that it never betrayed him into consciously forsaking logic for rhetoric, or into deviation from the strict thoroughness and honesty of his deliberate thought. The present work confirms that estimate. But even so, one needs to be upon one's guard lest the attractiveness of the thought and style, and the noble fervour of religious feeling characteristic of this book, unconsciously dazzle the mental eye and produce congenial conviction where the dialectic really fails to do so in the cold dry light of purely rational criticism. Such an effect the author himself could never have wished to produce upon his readers; but if beautiful style and earnestness of appeal are not to be allowed to usurp the part of cogent argument, a reader often needs, as in the case of this particular book, to reluctantly but deliberately protect himself against their illegitimate and unintentional plausibility.

It will be convenient to mention at the outset the subjects with which the lecturer deals. They are as follows: The relations of Natural and Revealed Religion, and of Faith and Reason, the Christian Idea of God and of His relation to the world, the origin and nature of evil, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Kingdom of the Spirit, and the Future Life.

It will be noticed that some of the earlier lectures deal with ground which was traversed in the author's previous work, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*. This is the case with those which discuss the first four subjects just enumerated. Dr. Caird's later and maturer treatment of these problems has the advantage over his earlier in clearness and conciseness, and in being less concerned with combating positions which at the present time have little more than an historical interest.

The first two lectures have for their object the definition of the functions of Philosophy with regard to Religion, and prepare the way for the writer's main purpose: namely, the interpretation of Christianity in terms of the idealistic system. Idealism for Principal Caird, it must be borne in mind, is Hegelian Idealism.

After vindicating his right to regard the treatment of the fundamental ideas of Christianity as a contribution to Natural Theology, the lecturer combats the popular hard and fast

distinction between Natural Religion and Revealed, and the claim, sometimes based upon that distinction, to remove the latter from the sphere of philosophical criticism, as if its ideas or doctrines were admittedly 'beyond' reason if not contrary to it. Revelation, it is urged, in one respect serves not so much 'to instruct us as to some transcendental order of things, not to superadd to what comes from ordinary and human sources of knowledge, something that pertains to a superhuman, supernatural sphere; but rather to enable us to penetrate to the moral and spiritual meaning of the world in which we live, and the teaching which, could we only read it aright, it yields to our minds' (i. 7).

It is further argued that, whatever be the *origin* of Revelation, 'it finds its only sufficient evidence in the consciousness of the believer' (i. 16); for this reason also, therefore, it falls within the scope of Philosophy, and must so far submit to the canons of pure reason. Revealed truth, in fact, does not belong to a different order from all other truth; and just because Christianity not merely adds to Natural Religion, but rather reinterprets it to itself, the one along with the other falls into the province of Philosophy.

The argument here developed, especially when supplemented by that of the next following lecture, is two-edged. It would cut away the ground from those who, like H. Spencer and his theological predecessors, would exclude Natural and Revealed Religion from the sphere of the knowable in the interests of Philosophy; and also from those who, on the other hand, repudiate contact with Philosophy in the supposed interests of Revealed Religion. Dr. Caird disposes of the arrogance of the former and the timidity of the latter position by establishing the conclusion that Christianity is not distinct from Natural Religion, but only Natural Religion transmuted into Revealed, and thereby made more profoundly rational and more truly natural than what is usually distinguished from Christianity by those very names. The only criticism which we have to make upon these arguments is that they would seem to make the identity of Natural and Revealed Religion more absolute than it is. We feel this when we come to our author's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity.

The second lecture, upon faith and reason, is in the first instance devoted to an examination of the conclusion, to which certain considerations would seem to lead, that faith or intuition, and not reason, is the organ of all religious knowledge; that recognition of religious truth is not so much an

19
ac
sa
of
kn
co
pli
an
tio
cer
tru
of
val
or
im
reli
led
oth
vest
renu
suic
reas
has
The
of m
mos
Scie
thou
elem
of th
tend
appli
other
D
sophy
of 't
thoug
to ex
called
metho
no co
our lit
such a
able to
sophic
VOL

act of reason as of direct perception akin to the perception, say, of beauty. It is admitted, of course, that in the sphere of religious truth we begin with intuition; but so we do in all knowledge, and yet sense perceptions in themselves do not constitute knowledge. 'Faith,' says Dr. Caird, 'is but implicit reason, reason working intuitively and unconsciously, and therefore without reflection, or criticism of its own operations' (i. 46). And inasmuch as the sanction of immediate certitude is often claimed for what, after all, only seems to be true, reason has obviously a function in examining the content of the religious consciousness, and in supplying a criterion of validity and truth as against illusion and error. Theology or Philosophy does not claim to substitute scientific for immediate knowledge, nor systematized religious truth for the religious life; it seeks to build upon such immediate knowledge and to bring it into relation with truth derived from other sources. There is a place, therefore, for rational investigation in the province of religious experience, the renunciation of which would be no less than intellectual suicide. 'That we must begin with faith, then, is . . . no reason why we should not advance to science' (i. 46).

It is not a waste of labour to thus point out that Philosophy has an important office to perform in the sphere of Theology. The distrust of 'Metaphysics' which has been so characteristic of much recent theological speculation, especially that of the most influential school of Germany, no less than of modern Science, has led to attempts to divorce religion from theoretic thought, to eliminate much of the objective and dogmatic element, and to develop forms of subjectivism. The author of the *Lectures* does not appear to have had these modern tendencies in mind, though what he writes is not wholly inapplicable to the premisses from which they, in common with other forms of subjective Theology, ultimately start.

Dr. Caird perhaps unduly narrows the function of Philosophy in Theology when he defines it (i. 54) as the translation of 'the necessarily inadequate language in which ordinary thought represents spiritual truth into that which is fitted to express it in its purely ideal reality.' To what may be called a theory of knowledge, an epistemology, suited to the methods and subject-matter of Theology, he offers little or no contribution. Yet it is precisely here that a gap exists in our literature on the Philosophy of Religion. And so long as such a gap remains, Christian Theology, we fear, will not be able to completely defend itself against the charge of philosophic dogmatism. The history of Philosophy immediately

before the time of Kant shows how futile philosophizing must be, without a previous analysis and criticism to ascertain the limits of the human faculties and the bounds of possible knowledge. When Hume's sceptical inquiries roused Kant from his 'dogmatic slumber,' the elaborate system of the Rationalistic school entered on a complete collapse. From that time there has gradually differentiated itself from the other branches of Philosophy a science which especially concerns itself with the nature, validity, and limits of knowledge. It has but lately received the separate name of epistemology. And the point which we would urge is that we have practically no corresponding specialised department, no pisteology, to deal with the foundations, nature, validity, and limits of religious faith.

The main work of the author begins when he undertakes, in Lecture III., to discuss the first 'fundamental idea' of Christianity, the Christian idea of God. The argument for its rationality is not new, though freshly stated. It is based upon the fact that unity and diversity or plurality are not mutually exclusive notions when ascribed to the same being or thing; bare unity is in fact an abstraction merely, and identical with nonentity. Further, there is an ascending series of unities, illustrated by the stone, the machine, the organism, the self-conscious intelligence; and the higher unity in each case includes within itself a greater degree of diversity or plurality. The individual's thought, for instance, is impossible without an object. And as without the external world there is no human thought, so without society there is no possibility of moral life, of love or sympathy, of right or wrong. And this is essentially true of all intelligence as such, and therefore must be true of God.

We pause at this point to remark that Dr. Caird's argument here begins to admit of question. We mean that although every idealist would probably accompany him thus far, henceforward some would begin to diverge. Some would say that he cleaves the individual experience into a dualism of subject and object rather than sees in it a duality within a unity, especially when speaking of the self-consciousness of God. Lotze would see sufficient condition for self-consciousness in the power of the Eternal Being to distinguish His Self from its own states which are not the Self. He would deny that an external reality is necessary to generate or develop consciousness of self in an infinite personality. But, to take up the thread of the present argument, Dr. Caird continues by meeting the objection that the isolated subject may

contain the *unrealized capacity* of thought, and thereby be constituted a perfect personality. He does so by affirming that 'an unrealized capacity is something different from, and less than, one which has become an actual, conscious, manifested reality' (i. 71). God, as such a bare unity, 'would be only a potential God. To *be* God, His knowledge must be eternally adequate to His being; He must for ever realize Himself in all the infinite riches of His nature. And this implies that there must be something to call forth that wealth, something to be known and loved by God, in order that knowledge and love may truly exist in God' (i. 72). But is the finite world enough for this? No, for then God *was* imperfect. 'That which is finite can never exhaustively express or reveal that which is infinite' (i. 74). God is thus, eternally, a self-revealing Spirit; and this involves diversity within His unity.

If Dr. Caird's view as to the essential conditions for experience or self-consciousness be granted, his argument is a sober and convincing piece of reasoning so far as it goes. We must be careful, however, in estimating to what length it actually carries us, as it may easily seem to an unwary reader to prove more than it does, and more than Dr. Caird probably intended it to accomplish. It must not be assumed to have been intended for a necessary deduction—a proof by pure reasoning—of what the Trinitarian holds by faith. Though this has been supposed by at least one able critic of the *Gifford Lectures*, it seems sufficiently obvious, on the other hand, to us, that Dr. Caird's argument claims to be no more than a vindication, in terms of presupposed Idealism, of the possibility and reasonableness of that belief, the doctrine itself being derived from other grounds and accepted for other reasons. The Principal writes:

*'If we are to ascribe to God an intellectual and moral nature, if we are to think of knowledge, goodness, holiness as essential elements of His being, if we are not to deny Him the perfection and blessedness which are expressed by the words love, self-surrender, self-sacrifice, then can this result only be reached by that conception which is expressed in the Christian doctrine of the Logos or Son of God—the conception of a self-revealing principle or personality within the very essence of the Godhead.'*¹

Now here the personality of God is obviously assumed; Theism is not deduced but presupposed. So, again, in a passage which we will also quote because we shall have to recur to it in another connexion:

¹ I. 70. The italics are ours.

'It is this difficulty which finds its solution in the Christian idea of God. *If* God be not merely the Spirit of the World, growing with its growth and partaking of its incompleteness, we must think of all that unfolds itself progressively in the history of the world—all possibilities of truth, goodness, beauty, which are disclosed in time, as already comprehended in the eternal self-revelation of God.'¹

We conclude from these and other passages that the author's object is simply to show that the Christian idea of God, purporting to be a theological theory necessitated by the historical facts of the revelation in Jesus Christ, is not an obscure or incomprehensible mystery wholly beyond reason, but on the other hand meets a certain intellectual difficulty better than any other form of Theism. In other words, he is concerned to show that if one is already committed to the belief in a personal God, then the most philosophical attitude open to us is to embrace the Trinitarian conception of Him. The unity of a plurality, which the first part of Dr. Caird's argument goes to prove, is simply that of a consciousness embracing a manifold content. The further continuation of the reasoning, that the finite world is insufficient to provide this manifold content for God's eternal consciousness, is designed to show that the manifold must be thought of as within God Himself. So far, the argument is valid if the original assumption of the idealist's Absolute Being is granted. If, now, the additional step be assumed which carries us from Idealism to Theism, it is possible to go further, and by the help of the ethical argument, based on the eternity of God's love, to infer that the plurality already established is a plurality of personalities. The still further step of proving by reason alone that the Godhead must be a unity of *three* personalities, taken by several of the Fathers and again in modern times by one wing of the idealistic school, is altogether unattempted by our author, who is also silent upon the endeavours of others in this direction. He merely seems in this lecture to have in view the philosophical justification of the Logos doctrine, and makes no allusion to the necessary existence of a third Person within the Godhead.

Thus the argument in Lecture III. is very far from offering a complete and purely rational deduction of the Christian doctrine of the Three in One. We are glad to observe that Dr. Caird, for all his enthusiasm for Hegelianism, makes no attempt to supplement the limited range of the argument with any pseudo-philosophical speculation such as we meet

¹ I. 75-76. Italics again ours.

with, for instance, in the well-known *Christian Dogmatics* of Bishop Martensen.

The problem of the relation of God to the world, which the lecturer takes up next, is perhaps the most intractable within the sphere of theological metaphysics. It is pre-eminently the rock upon which the sublime and magnificent system of Spinoza went to pieces; and from his time to the present day it has supplied the breaking strain to theoretic thought. The problem of evil, moreover, is after all only an appendage to it. As the difficulty in question is one which is implicated perhaps more than any other in the practical or working theology of the Church, and lies behind the disputes which, since the great Christological controversy, have most deeply troubled its history, we naturally read with rather more than usual curiosity the three chapters in which, negatively and positively, Dr. Caird seeks to defend and to elucidate the solution of it involved in Christianity. These lectures, moreover, form the most original portion of the work.

The writer has not much difficulty in showing the inadequacy of Pantheism on the one hand and Deism on the other, to bridge the gulf between the infinite and the finite without violence to the reality of either. It is in the Christian idea of God, already expounded in part, that the solution of the problem, in his opinion, lies. This idea is identified with the conception of the Absolute Being as necessarily or essentially 'self-revealing.' But the author's own words shall be quoted to sketch the lines along which his thought is to travel in these lectures:

'In the idea . . . of God as infinite Self-consciousness or Self-revealing Spirit, we attain to the conception of an Infinite Being who neither limits nor is limited by the finite world, but reveals or realises Himself therein; and, on the other hand, of a finite world which is neither absorbed in, nor irreconcilably opposed to, the Infinite, but finds its reality and perfection only in union with the being and life of God. For, as I shall attempt to show, it is of the very essence of mind or spirit that it contains in it the necessity of self-manifestation in objective form, and therefore that which we speak of as 'the creation of the world' must be conceived as the expression not of arbitrary will but of the very nature and being of God. Yet, on the other hand, while infinite mind or spirit implies a world of objects, in one sense external to and other than itself, it is also of its very nature that it should not be limited, but, so to speak, expanded and enriched by their existence. Finally, it is involved in the idea of Infinite Intelligence that whilst it comprehends and subordinates to itself all finite things and beings, it yet

does not suppress or tamper with their individuality and independence, but is rather the very source and principle of it; and therefore the infinitude of God, so conceived, is not only not inconsistent with, but is the very spring and secret of the life of nature, and of the moral and spiritual life of man' (i. 84-5).

Pantheism, as Dr. Caird points out, pretending to be the deification of the world, involves in reality its nothingness. It may be true, as he asserts, that the pantheistic idea of God has developed from man's sense of the vanity and unreality of finite things; certainly, in the individual who found for Pantheism its most elaborate speculative expression, this was so. But when Dr. Caird turns aside to argue, with a view to future purposes, that the sense of the unreality of the finite is itself the implicit recognition of the *existence* of such a being as God, he would seem to be repeating the fallacy of the old ontological argument, and to be identifying existence with thought. We need not follow the author through his argument against Pantheism, as he brings nothing new to its demolition beyond his forcible re-statement of its well-known metaphysical, moral, and religious defects. Moreover, Spinozism is the only form of this system which Dr. Caird attacks, whereas the hold which Pantheism has at all times obtained is primarily due to its very multiformity. It would, perhaps, have been more useful had the Principal endeavoured to embrace within his argument some treatment at the same time of the later forms of pantheistic doctrine. Spinoza's 'infinite substance' may well be 'the grave of all things, the productive source of nothing;' but Pantheism cannot, surely, be crushed with this criticism, in the forms in which it has reappeared in post-Kantian German Idealism.

Deism may be regarded as a reaction from Pantheism, emphasising unduly the independence of the finite world which the other system volatilised away, and conceiving of God under dangerously anthropomorphic analogies. Of the two extremes this is the one into which popular Christianity is more liable to lapse; and, not to speak of the general trend of Western Theology, actual lapses within the Church have been much more common in this direction than in that of Pantheism. Deism, in fact, possesses immense advantages over Pantheism in easily lending itself to religious feeling; indeed, as Dr. Caird remarks (i. 133), 'the deistic attitude of mind is so akin to our ordinary habits of thought that we find it surviving and betraying its influence even under a religion with whose fundamental principle it is radically inconsistent.' It is well worth while to be reminded that

our ordinary popular theological language and modes of thought are unconsciously tinged somewhat deeply with deistic implications.

As a solution of the philosophical problem of the relation of the world to God, however, Deism is no more tenable than the system to which it stands so diametrically opposed; and it is incomparably less frequently to be met with as a formal system. Here, again, Dr. Caird is able to point out with ease, acuteness, and force, the manifest defects of a one-sided theory. The anthropomorphism of the deistic idea of God, and the arbitrariness of His relation to the world which it involves, are its especial points of weakness.

In the former of the two lectures devoted to the exposition of the Christian theory of the relation of God to the world, Principal Caird aims at proving the following three propositions: (1) that the reality of the finite world is constituted by Infinite Mind, not only as its Creator but also as its all-sustaining and all-pervading Spirit; (2) that by its very nature Infinite Mind has in it a necessity of self-manifestation to and in a world of finite beings; (3) that God's infinitude, rather than involving the suppression of the finite, is the principle of the individuality and independence of nature and man. We have already quoted the passage of which these statements may be regarded as an analysis. The first of these propositions amounts to the declaration that Idealism or Spiritualism is the only tenable ontological theory; and, in its discussion, that system is explained and defended against the ordinary objections of 'common sense' or naïve realism. The third is of minor importance than the second, in which a serious problem is involved; and the author's treatment of this problem we watch with interest. It seems a bold undertaking—though speculative intrepidity is, of course, to be looked for in a follower of Hegel—to convert the proposition 'without the idea of God, nature and man would be unintelligible,' into 'without nature and man, God would be unintelligible.' Yet Dr. Caird maintains that 'God fulfils Himself, realizes His own nature, in the existence of the world;' that such self-manifestation and realization are inherently necessary to Him as God, to His perfection, His self-consciousness, His moral nature; that the very being and blessedness of God are implicated in the existence, the perfection, the salvation, of finite souls' (i. 155).

The source of that conception of the relation between God and the world which Dr. Caird here presents to us, is of course the Hegelian notion of development. It is true that the 'three-

fold movement' supposed by Hegel to be involved in the act of knowledge, which idealists of the Leibniz-Lotze school regard as a tissue of arbitrary and unmeaning imagination, is not here laid down as the basis from which the 'Self-realization' of God is deduced: but the world-process is evidently conceived after the image of that movement. And when Dr. Caird asserts that (i. 192) 'in the life of God there are no unrealised possibilities,' a sentence which contains in germ the theory here elaborated, we see at once the influence of another root-idea of the Hegelian system, according to which God is the 'absolute and eternal unity of knowing and being.' We have thus called the attention of the reader, who may be unacquainted with the history of Philosophy, to the source from which Dr. Caird's theory takes its origin, in order that he may be aware that questions are assumed in it which constitute the very deepest line of cleavage between the Idealistic schools. We need only add, by way of preface to our examination of the theory, that the notion of development, which, like other Hegelian notions, has temptingly lent itself to the Christian theologian, is for him a dangerous guide and ally.

As we read Dr. Caird's endeavour to justify his theory, we believe that another possible source of mistake emerges. We doubt if he has not sometimes fallen into essentially the same error as that which he has himself brought to light with such acuteness in the system of Deism. He seems, in fact, to have laid himself open to the charge of possible anthropomorphism in his conception of the divine nature. He has transferred too unreservedly and unquestioningly many of the characteristics of human personality into the infinite personality of God. We felt that he was dangerously near to the committal of this error in the earlier lecture on the *Idea of God*, when he assumed that what are undoubtedly necessary conditions for the self-consciousness of a finite Spirit are necessarily so also for the self-consciousness or personality of God, instead of being, very possibly, mere consequences of our finiteness. He now further attributes to God, as necessary to the perfection of His Being, a capacity for suffering and sacrifice, on the ground that the purest blessedness which we mortals know is that which comes through pain and sorrow. Even granting the truth of this statement for human experience, which, we presume, may admit of question, it may still be asked whether the fact which it alleges might not perhaps be accounted for by the finiteness of human nature, and whether the application of the idea to the infinite per-

sonality of God is not attended with difficulties. The precariousness of thus arguing from the finite to the infinite does not seem, in this part of the Principal's work, to have been sufficiently borne in mind.

The author has, of course, in attempting a solution of the problem of the relation between God and the world, to steer between the two rocks of Pantheism and Deism. The latter theory attributes the derivation of the world to an arbitrary creative fiat, and it is this element of arbitrariness which Dr. Caird labours to avoid. The pantheistic theory, on the other hand, regards the world as a necessary and inevitable development of the nature of God, and, in so doing, both obliterates the finite in the infinite and involves a thorough-going determinism. Dr. Caird sails much nearer to the latter danger than to the former, if indeed he does not actually run aground upon it. Shrinking from the arbitrary nature of the divine act of will to which Deism, conceiving of that will anthropomorphically after the pattern of man's, attributes the existence of the world, he refuses to derive the world from the divine *will* at all, and grounds its origin in the essential nature of God. Philosophy is not logically justified in such a step, however, until it has shown the impossibility of a conception of a divine will that is free from the element of arbitrariness, or of any mean between arbitrariness and necessary and involuntary development. The will to create may be an eternal predicate of God; and eternal will may be distinguished, it would seem to us, from involuntary determination as well as from arbitrary indifference. Certainly it may be so for all that Dr. Caird has written, for this way out of the difficulty, if a way it be, is passed over without an allusion. He consequently remains committed to the view that God requires the world in order to supply an opportunity for His self-manifestation, and that without it, and indeed without its evil also, its sin and misery, He would be an imperfect and deficient Being. Now, without venturing to frame a theory of our own upon a matter so abstruse, and as to which there exist wide differences of thought among writers on the Philosophy of Religion, we may express the conviction that that propounded by Dr. Caird is not tenable without considerable, and indeed essential, modification. It seems to us to be practically a return to the Pantheism from which the Christian solution was to be carefully distinguished. It is difficult to see how the world is to serve as a means for actually generating and developing the self-consciousness and love of God, without making it a mere element in Him, a

mere repetition of Him; without, in short, absorbing the finite back into the infinite. We feel that Dr. Caird's depreciation of potentiality, and his insistence upon the necessity of the full actualization through external circumstance of all 'possibility' in the intelligence and love of God, is too absolute. Indeed, the argument seems to prove too much. For if a finite and evil world be *necessary* to the perfect development of God's nature, if no knowledge and no love can be perfect unless their every possible object and direction for outgoing has been exhausted by creation, then anything short of an infinite number of such finite worlds would seem to be insufficient for their realized perfection.

And we may point out that this theory brings back the very difficulty for which, as was stated in Lecture III. (i. 75), the Christian idea of God finds a solution. It is there argued that 'if the finite world were the *only*¹ medium of the divine self-revelation, it would follow that the nature of God was a progressive one;' that there must have been a time when He was 'less perfect, less blessed than now;' and that 'absolute perfection' would be a goal that never could be reached; but that the Logos doctrine serves to avert the necessity of such inferences by providing potentially within the Godhead, from eternity, that which unfolds itself progressively in the history of the world. In this passage it seems the idea of a development in God is one to be avoided by the Trinitarian idea; but in the proposed theory of the relation of the world to God such an idea is deliberately provided for. In this passage also, *potential* comprehension of all possibilities is the condition for perfection in God before the creation of the finite, but, in the later theory, revelation through creation is regarded as necessary in order to provide *actualisation* instead of potential comprehension, and potential comprehension is distinctly stated to fall short of perfection. These seem to be palpable inconsistencies. Further, if the actual finite world be a *necessary* medium of the divine self-realization, then surely, whether it constitutes the only medium or a second, it would equally follow that the nature of God 'was a progressive one.' Lastly, if the nature of God was eternally and fully self-revealed through the Logos, as is implied in the deduction of the idea of God, why should a further self-revelation and self-realization be necessary through nature and finite spirits, as is required in the author's theory of the derivation of the world?

It thus seems that if 'becoming' is admitted into the essential nature of God, the idea of His eternal blessedness

¹ Italics ours.

and perfection is to be abandoned. It is safer, therefore, to regard the world as a consequence of, rather than a condition for, God's all-sufficiency. Perhaps, after all, we are in the presence of a problem which is quite beyond the compass of man's intelligence. We certainly feel that the theory by which Principal Caird has attempted to solve it correlates in a very fascinating manner various scattered Christian truths, and throws fresh light upon several passages of the New Testament ; but for all that it seems to us, if we have rightly apprehended it, to create more difficulties than it solves, to be fraught with inconsistencies, and to leave room for a more balanced mediation between the claims of the impossible extremes of deistic and pantheistic thought.

It would be easy to enumerate several problems such as that of the relation of the Supreme Spirit who is 'all in all' to the world of finite spirits, each of whom is an independent individuality, of which Dr. Caird's theory does not take note, but which call for solution from any adequate attempt to elucidate the relation of the finite and the infinite. But we must not linger further upon this portion of Dr. Caird's work, although, as we have said, it forms the central point of interest in his book. We pass on to consider his treatment of the problem of evil, its nature and origin, to which several lectures are devoted.

The author discusses in turn the Augustinian theory, the theory of negation or privation, the theory which makes evil consist in the predominance of sense over spirit, and the theory of free-will. The first of these is analysed in a very masterly manner. The truth which it guards, the fact, namely, of the solidarity of the race, is dwelt upon as its strong point as compared with the weakness of all purely individualistic explanations of the origin and nature of sin ; and there is much able and acute criticism of various subsidiary theories which have grown up around it. The discussion of the other theories is not so interesting, and, but for passages here and there of singular eloquence, would perhaps have to be pronounced a little tedious. Negative criticism is undoubtedly Dr. Caird's strong point ; that we are made to feel throughout his book. But several of the views which his criticism completely shatters, such as that, for instance, of man's total depravity noticed in the twelfth lecture, are hardly worth the expenditure of so much energy as he devotes to them, unless, indeed, their survival in Scotland is more noticeable than with us.

The negative or privative theory of evil is shown to be the natural outgrowth of the pantheistic conception of God's

relation to the world. Compelled, as Pantheism is, to make God the author of evil, it identifies sin with finitude, limitation, imperfection ; or, when thoroughly logical and consistent, reduces it to nonentity, an 'illusion of the finite.' In any case, it 'leaves unexplained, in the moral sphere, the consciousness of guilt ; in the religious sphere, the sense of estrangement from God.' And the view which would see the source of sin in the sensuous nature of man, in the corporeal state which is the condition of the individuality of the finite spirit, is only, at bottom, another form of that which identifies sin with finite limitation. Though preferable in some respects to the former theory, it has its peculiar difficulties and shortcomings. In particular, it denies that the source of sin lies in the will. But there is a view which makes the will the source of sin, but at the same time 'destroys responsibility in seeking to defend it' (ii. 54). This is the deistic theory which seeks to account for sin by endowing man with free-will in the sense of absolute liberty of indifference, really equivalent to absolute irresponsibility. Moral accountability cannot be based upon such freedom as presupposes an absolutely characterless mind and will ; for the will is the self. The negative criticism of this view leads to the enunciation of another derived from the notion of God's relation to the world, previously expounded by the author ; the principle 'that it is of God's very essence to manifest Himself in and to the finite world. In other words, that the finite spirit is the necessary organ of the being and life of God, and that this self-revelation implies in the finite spirit an element of distinction or difference which contains in it at least the possibility of sin' (ii. 4). The will, Dr. Caird writes (ii. 57), is the capacity of realizing the true end of our nature. The good will finds its satisfaction in this self-realization, which is redeemed from the appearance of selfishness by the fact that the self here indicated 'is not the private, particular self of this or that individual, but the universal, and in a sense infinite self which is implied in the phrase "made in the image of God"' (ii. 64). Sin is therefore simply perverted, false self-realization, or, in other words, selfishness as contrasted with that absolute self-surrender to God in which religion consists. Dr. Caird claims that on this theory each individual spirit preserves a real independence of God, and is not merged into Him, as is the case in Pantheism ; for the blending and identification of the finite will with that of God, in which true self-realization consists, is the work of the finite being itself. So far as it goes, Dr.

Caird's view of the origin and nature of evil seems to be far more satisfactory than any of the others which he passes under review. But on the deeper problem of the compatibility of the existence of evil with the goodness of God, he does not attempt to throw much light. The connexion of his analysis of the nature of evil with his view of the relation of God and the world, and his principle that God is necessarily self-revealing to a world of finite spirits is very slenderly traced. Indeed, beyond the single sentence quoted above from ii. 4, in which the self-revelation of God in and to the finite spirit is said to imply there an element of distinction which contains in it at least the possibility of sin, we find no reference to this connexion, and therefore no attempt to explain or to justify its mere assertion.

As a connecting link between the subject of evil and that of Redemption (the Incarnation and Atonement, &c.), we have from Dr. Caird a lecture upon the Possibility of Moral Restoration.

This discusses, in terms of the philosophical views previously developed, the mode in which moral restitution can be rationally conceived as brought about; and, in so doing, it brings out the unique glory of Christianity among all other religions. By this we mean the fact that Christianity alone professes not only to reveal God and to promulgate a moral law, but also to provide a power from without, actually enabling the spirit of man to control his lower nature and emancipate his will from the sway of evil habit; in other words, the fact that 'grace' as well as 'truth' came by Jesus Christ. The writer's treatment of grace will not seem wholly adequate to English Churchmen, but none the less his lecture will be found by all to be full of valuable suggestion and to be suffused with religious earnestness. The contrast between the powerlessness of the moral ideal presented to us as an abstract law and its efficacy when presented in the living personality of a Being whom we can love and who loves us, is drawn at length in a passage (ii. 82-97) which we have never, perhaps, seen equalled for its noble eloquence; devotion so impassioned, controlled to express itself in words so calm, makes us almost feel the presence of a great and pure soul.

This lecture marks the transition from the pre-eminently philosophical portion of the work to that which we may distinguish as more largely theological. In the next we are introduced to the subject of the Incarnation. Consistently with the main object of the lectures as a whole, Dr. Caird seeks to show that the Incarnation, in so far as it is to be

regarded as 'a divine expedient to meet the moral necessities of a fallen and guilty race,' is one 'which is grounded in the very nature both of God and man, of the Infinite Spirit and the finite spirit which He has made in His own image' (ii. 101, 102). The way for this has been already prepared by the previous recognition of what Dr. Caird, in not perhaps the best chosen words, speaks of as a 'human element' in God, and of a divine or ideal element in man. These at once form the ground of the possibility of an Incarnation, and are revealed or brought to light by means of it. Still, the idea of a union in the person of Christ, an individual personality, of the human and the divine, the finite and the infinite, presents intellectual difficulties: difficulties, indeed, which, on certain presuppositions as to the nature of God and man, are insuperable, because involving the union of absolutely incompatible attributes. The various expedients to which recourse has been had to meet these difficulties are classified by Principal Caird under two heads: those which exclude or modify the divine, and those which exclude or modify the human nature of Christ respectively, in order to make the one capable of union with the other. The Deistic view, which excludes the divine nature, is traced to the Deistic conception of God as an impassible and immutable Being in such a sense as to deny Him any sympathy or compassion for human griefs. This is briefly dismissed; but a lengthy examination is undertaken of various forms of the kenotic theory, which are here classed amongst the attempts to tamper with the divine nature of our Lord. Of course, it is rather with the possibility of forming a rational conception of what is involved in these theories and with the speculative difficulties which beset them, than with their efficacy to simply state Gospel facts adequately and impartially, that Dr. Caird is concerned; and this is undoubtedly the side of the problem which has received least attention. The main difficulty which Dr. Caird points out as involved in the notion of a self-emptying God, of an omniscience resolving to be ignorant of what it knows, is 'the contradiction of a nature which at once is and is not, which asserts itself in the very act of denying itself.' For 'not only does the lessening or depotentiating act contain in it the element of power which is supposed to be renounced, but the same contradiction must continue through the whole history of the self-suppressing infinite' (ii. 127-8). Turning to that particular side of the kenosis problem which has especially engaged attention in our own time, that of our Lord's knowledge as Man, Dr. Caird forcibly states the impossibility of constr-

ing in thought the idea of an omniscient Being renouncing His knowledge. 'To carry into effect the resolution not to know any object of knowledge,' he says, 'it must think that object. In other words, it must know it in the very endeavour not to know it. The self-renunciation of omniscience, the self-reduction of infinite to finite knowledge, is thus a contradiction in terms.' This is an argument which we ourselves have previously used, and we do not feel that any such attempts as we have met with to lessen its force have been successful.¹

The other arguments adduced by Dr. Caird against the kenosis theory, we must admit, are not of equal validity. They are vitiated by neglect of the fact that a kenosis is usually only conceived as having taken place *within the sphere of Christ's human nature*. The remark (ii. 130), 'The Being who limits or suppresses His infinitude becomes finite and nothing more,' and the difficulty raised (ii. 131) as to the cosmical functions of the Logos during the thirty years of the earthly life, are therefore irrelevant to the controversy as we know it. We feel also that, when the writer goes on, in the latter portion of the lecture, to appropriate for his own use what he regards as 'elements of truth' contained in the theory he has just rejected as rationally untenable, he passes with very unjustifiable lightness over the difficulty which called such theories into being; the fact, namely, that the Gospels assign limits to our Lord's knowledge as Man. It is easy to see in Christ's sorrow and suffering 'a manifestation of the nature of God in its essential and unmodified reality,' requiring no laying aside of essential attributes; for, as Dr. Caird says further on (ii. 139): 'The divine immutability is not the mere absence or impossibility of change, but the immutability of absolute spiritual perfection; and *that*, when we examine what it means, is consistent with an infinite flexibility and variety of experience.' It is possible, from analogy with human experience, to regard sympathy and suffering as compatible with perfect blessedness; but, as Dr. Caird has himself just shown, it seems impossible to make ignorance compatible with divine omniscience. His promise, therefore, to show that all the speculative difficulties attending the unity in One Personality of the divine and human natures vanish on removal of misconceptions as to the attributes of God and man, stands wholly unredeemed. The omission, in the constructive portion of this lecture, of the

¹ On the subject of Kenosis see *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xxxiii. No. 65 (Oct. 1891), vol. xlv. No. 88 (July 1897), and vol. xlvii. No. 94 (Jan. 1899).

one difficulty which lends all the point to his destructive criticism in its earlier pages, must, of course, have been made unconsciously; but inasmuch as the difficulty is as real for himself as for those whose theory he has been attacking, little value attaches to Dr. Caird's positive contribution to the problem. The same must also be said of the 'element of truth' which was sought after in the heresy of Apollinaris. Dr. Caird takes pains to show that 'in the person and life of Christ we can recognize a nature from which every dividing, disturbing element has passed away—a mind that was the pure medium of Infinite Intelligence, a heart that throbbed in perfect unison with the Infinite Love, a will that never vibrated by one faintest aberration from the Infinite Will, a human consciousness possessed and suffused by the very spirit and life of the Living God.' It is difficult to find here, however, any contribution to the problem of how to conceive of the union of the two natures in Christ. All that is thus said could be consistently subscribed to by an Arian. A perfect man, with a soul possessed and suffused by the spirit and life of God, is not necessarily at the same time, in the Christian sense, incarnate God. There is much that is suggestive in these lectures on the Incarnation, but they leave the philosophical problem exactly as it stood, and, we think we may say, untouched.

The superiority of Principal Caird's critical over his constructive powers, which we have already had occasion more than once to notice, is again exhibited in his treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement. We are, of course, not saying anything new when we assert that the Church has never possessed any satisfactory theory of the Atonement. This is a conviction which cannot but be deepened by a study of the three lectures devoted to the subject in the work before us. Doubtless several of the analogies and arguments derived from human experience have afforded us for a time some relief from the pressure of this or that particular difficulty; but only to prove perhaps, on more deliberate thought and after a return from the particular aspect to the wider view of this many-sided problem as a whole, insufficient and inadequate. Dr. Caird's critical insight seems to us to penetrate more deeply than that of most modern writers on this doctrine, enabling him to see a weakness here and there, in partial views more or less widely accepted, which has hitherto escaped attention. When he comes to reconstruct, however, if indeed in this connexion he can be said to do so, we find again that he fails to help us in any material degree.

St. Anselm's theory, a more serious attempt than any which preceded it to give 'speculative grounding' to the relation between Christ's life and death and the remission of sins, is a typical example of various endeavours to extract a solution of a moral and spiritual problem from a mere metaphor or figure. Its various shortcomings are pointed out with great force and clearness by Dr. Caird, but we need not follow him over ground that is so familiar.

The forensic or substitutionary theory is in much closer contact with the popular thought of to-day; and though it receives from our author considerable criticism, it is much more congenial to his mind than its predecessor, especially when remodelled, or supplemented and safeguarded, in ways which he suggests. Principal Caird's treatment of this theory will probably be interesting to many of his readers, inasmuch as he deals with several positions adopted in recent works, and does not seem to be wholly in agreement with all those maintained in the well-known and influential work of Dr. Dale—an author, however, to whom he does not expressly refer. There is no sign in what Dr. Caird has written upon this subject of any influence upon him of the recent tendency in some quarters to minimize the meaning of the sufferings and death of Christ in connexion with the work of Redemption. He makes no approach, that is to say, towards the identification of the Atonement with the Incarnation, a view which, after some tentative and hesitating preparation in the minds of several writers, received definite expression in the *Hulsean Lectures* of Archdeacon Wilson two years or so after Principal Caird's *Gifford Lectures* were delivered.

The lecture on the Kingdom of the Spirit is chiefly valuable for the remarks which it contains on the superiority of opportunity for deep knowledge of Christ, and the fundamental truths revealed by Him, enjoyed by believers in post-Christian times as compared with that possessed by His contemporaries. The association of this thought with the difficult saying to St. Thomas as to the blessedness of those who have not seen and yet have believed, throws a significant light upon that declaration of our Lord. But though this lecture, like many of the others, is rich in pointed and suggestive sayings, we search it in vain for guidance to a philosophical conception of the relation in which the risen and ascended Christ stands to the society of believers. Upon this point Dr. Caird writes:

'As an individual person He has long passed away from the world; but He lives for ever as the ever-present, ever-active

principle of its highest life. Nor, in so far as we believe Him to be the highest manifestation of God, the perfect expression of the divine life, can we, save in some such way as this, conceive of His relation to mankind' (ii. 246).

Such language, from a writer so lucid and a thinker so clear as Principal Caird, is disappointing. We believe it entirely inadequate to express his own personal belief, for whom we assume it had some meaning. But to us a 'living principle' is a meaningless phrase. It would be difficult to estimate the gain that would ensue to accuracy and clearness of thought if that one word 'principle' were expunged from the vocabulary of all philosophical and theological thinkers. It seems capable of denoting anything that one is too lazy to define, from a living person to an abstract quality or relation, if not to an unthinkable nonentity. It certainly serves here to completely cloak the writer's meaning from his reader's view.

As regards the relation of the members of the kingdom to one another, Dr. Caird says very little. He touches, and but briefly, solely on the ideal aspect of the Church, and does not attempt to deduce from the relation of Christ to His kingdom or from His immanence in the world, any theory of sacramental operation.

The lecturer deals finally with the subject of the Future Life. The question which he sets himself to answer is 'Can we find any reason for this faith outside of the sphere of Christian doctrine?' We may therefore say that in the last two lectures a return is made to what is usually called the sphere of Rational Theology. This is hardly to speak correctly, however, because Dr. Caird, in his opening lecture, himself demolished the artificial barrier between Natural Religion (including Rational) and Revealed, and in his treatment of purely Christian doctrines such as those of the Incarnation and Atonement has shown that their subject-matter can be approached from the rational standpoint.

The main argument which the author develops is drawn from the inherent greatness of human nature. It is an appeal to the practical reason. 'If a career of boundless attainment in knowledge, goodness, happiness, is possible for us, there must be in the very structure of our being indications of such a career, something that transcends the sphere of time and allies us in essence to the things unseen and eternal. Are any such indications to be found in our nature?' (ii. 256). Dr. Caird answers that there are, and that they are to be found in, firstly, our intelligence, which, as it perceives things

in time, cannot be itself a thing of time ; and, secondly, in the fact that our intellectual and moral endowments are on a scale immeasurably larger than the needs of this life demand. The argument is forcibly and eloquently stated, and should appeal to all whose philosophy of the world and of human life does not profess to exclude the category of 'meaning.' Various objections to the argument, based upon facts of human experience and usually held to be suggestive of an outlook other than the Idealistic, are stated with as much force and sympathy as the argument itself. In so far, however, as they are the outcome of materialistic metaphysic, they subsequently receive a sufficient and obvious answer on the usual lines. This we do not need to recapitulate ; for Materialism is admittedly defunct, although its consequences will long continue to survive in the minds of the illogical ; and we must be content with a mere allusion to the able vindication of the doctrine of future rewards against the several plausible objections that have been urged against it. In the last paragraph of the book the whole problem of immortality is admitted to be insoluble to the man who has no faith in God. On the other hand, it is impossible to disbelieve in a future life *if* there be a God, 'and *if* that God be manifested in that which is best and greatest in man, above all, in the man Christ Jesus.' Thus we are recalled to the premisses from which the work sets out. Principal Caird has not attempted to deduce the fully developed Christian theology from necessities of thought. He has taken the Christian revelation as it stands, and the Idealistic philosophy as he has learned it, for granted, and has endeavoured to show how the fundamental ideas of the one, so far from being contrary to reason, are capable of receiving a rational justification in terms of the first principles of the other. The Christian does not ground his deepest convictions upon the precarious basis of abstract thought, but upon historical and objective facts. Yet he desires to interpret his faith to his reason, and in the theories which he frames to correlate the facts and think his way to inferences beyond them, he is concerned that the demands of rationality be satisfied. This is as much his duty as his privilege. We believe that the *Gifford Lectures* of Dr. Caird afford valuable assistance towards such an end, though in the course of this review we have had occasion to point out several directions in which his guidance is not wholly trustworthy. His thought is not altogether free from inconsistencies, and inconsistencies of a somewhat serious kind ; and there are weaknesses and dangerous tendencies here and there which seem to us to be

largely due to the peculiar form of Idealism of which Dr. Caird was the enthusiastic representative. But the work is one of the greatest value, and of a kind of which we possess far too few, considering the intellectual needs of this particular time. We have much cause to be grateful to the Master of Balliol for the publication of the lectures, and for the beautiful memoir of his brother with which he has enriched the work.

ART. V.—THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

1. *A History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.* By W. W. CAPES, M.A., Rector of Bramsholt and Honorary Canon of Winchester. (London, 1900.)
2. *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. LXIII. (article 'John Wycliffe.' By the Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, B.D.) (London, 1900.)
3. *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform.* By R. L. POOLE, M.A., Ph.D. (London, 1890.)
4. *England in the Age of Wycliffe.* By G. M. TREVELYAN, M.A. (London, 1899.)
5. *The Peasant Rising and the Lollards.* Documents: edited by EDGAR POWELL and G. M. TREVELYAN. (London, 1899.)

IN a previous article¹ we discussed some aspects of the career of Wyclif. We gave illustrations of his opinions, and we compared them with those of his contemporaries and successors, so far as they appeared to have a direct bearing on the movement which eventually produced the English Reformation. In our last number the causes of that great movement were discussed, in view of the position assumed by Dr. Gasquet in the collection of papers which he entitled *The Eve of the Reformation*. The publication of two recent works enables us to return to the subject, to discuss it in other aspects, and to continue it to a period nearer to the time when the Church of England actually cast off the bonds of Rome.

The two works to which we refer are *The History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, by Canon Capes, and the article by Dr. Hastings Rashdall in

¹ Vol. xlviii. no. 96.

vol. lxiii. of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, on 'John Wycliffe.'

Full and accurate as Dr. Rashdall's article is, interesting as is his analysis of Wyclif's writings, important as are some of the rectifications of the dates ordinarily accepted which he suggests, there is nothing in what he has written which obliges us in any way to modify our judgment on the principles by which Wyclif was guided. Starting as a schoolman of the most crabbed sort, he eventually became what in later days would be called a Protestant in a very full sense of the word. So thorough was his iconoclasm that the most extreme of German theologians to-day welcome him as a brother. There are evidently many points on which Dr. Rashdall welcomes him too. More it is hardly necessary for us to say.

We pass to a general consideration of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to which we are invited. We have shown how far Wyclif's views on the Eucharist, indulgences, the monks, the friars, were accepted or controverted by typical writers among those who succeeded him, by Pecock, by Gascoigne. Dr. Gasquet's baseless assertion of the designing use of confused ideas as to the limits of the spiritual and the temporal have also been examined. We turn now rather to emphasize, as recently published materials enable us to do, two special causes which led eventually to the Reformation. We refer to the abuses connected with patronage as it was controlled by the Court of Rome, and to the marked neglect of direct teaching in the Church of England towards the close of the Middle Ages.

Curiously enough, few men could be better fitted by personal experience to describe the abuses which he denounced than John Wyclif himself. The list of his preferments, as is well known, is a considerable one. But the Vatican archives have recently been discovered to show how persistent were the applications made to Rome on his behalf for licence to hold pluralities. In 1362 the University of Oxford petitioned Urban V. to exercise the papal power of 'provision' on his behalf, contrary to the Act of Provisors, by granting him 'a canonry and prebend and a dignity of York, notwithstanding that he holds the church of Filingham.' The petition was not granted in exactly the form in which it was asked; but a prebend in the church of Westbury-on-Trym, diocese of Worcester, was granted instead.¹ Wyclif got his plurality, but he was not content with it. Whether he was at the same time

¹ *English Historical Review*, July 1900, p. 529.

Master of Balliol seems uncertain ; but it is admitted that he made only brief residence at Fillingham. Dr. Rashdall's apology, if we may call it so, is interesting :—

'Wyclif's early life must have been spent at Oxford as a student and teacher, first in arts, then in theology. The normal time required from entrance to the University for attaining the D.D. degree was not less than sixteen years. Wyclif's works show him to have been powerfully influenced by the writings of Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh, once a fellow of Balliol College. There is no reason to believe that Wyclif resided much at Fillingham, and he was probably only occasionally resident at Ludgershall, a benefice nearer Oxford, in the presentation of the Prior of the Hospital of St. John, for which he exchanged Fillingham in 1368. It must be remembered that the University teachers received no regular salary or endowments, and (if not fellows of colleges) had to depend upon ecclesiastical preferment. Being unable to obtain a prebend upon which he could live, he was compelled to become a more or less non-resident rector. He obtained a two years' licence of non-residence for study at Oxford from the Bishop of Lincoln in 1368, and may probably have required such a licence at other times.'¹

We confess we do not see the compulsion of which Dr. Rashdall speaks. No one compelled Wyclif to take the degree of D.D., and he certainly had not 'to depend upon ecclesiastical preferment,' being, as Dr. Rashdall has said, a few lines above the passage we quote, a fellow and subsequently master of his college. However that may be, poor or rich, Wyclif was not satisfied. In 1373 he was granted by Gregory XI.—

'to retain his canonry and prebend of Westbury even after he obtains possession of a canonry and prebend of Lincoln ; notwithstanding the clause to the contrary in the provision lately made to him by the Pope of a canonry of Lincoln, with expectation of a prebend, soon after which provision he became licentiate, and then master of theology.'²

He appears, therefore, besides lecturing at Oxford and probably retaining his fellowship, to have been a canon of Lincoln, and a canon and prebendary of Westbury as well as rector of Ludgershall. 'It is probable,' says Dr. Rashdall, 'that Wyclif objected to pluralities.'³

But though we do not find in Wyclif's career that personal objection to the abuses of papal patronage that we might have expected, we have not to make a long search before we

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. lxiii. p. 204.

² *English Historical Review*, July 1900, p. 530.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 204.

come upon a mass of scandals due to 'provisions' from Rome.¹ Mr. Capes, whose book cannot be said to be well arranged, gives us here and there instances, but no collected description of the state of affairs. He observes, however, that Archbishop Scrope, in the rebellion of 1405, 'painted the abuses of patronage in the darkest colours.' His manifesto stated that 'scarce a prelate could be found who had not made an unholy compact to retain a half or a third of the value of the benefices which he had to give; young illiterates were promoted who could bear witness to the sins of spiritual patrons.'² The archbishop declared these abuses to be due to interference with the Pope's power of provision. Henry IV. took another view. He resolutely refused to admit the Pope's nominees. Henry V. 'sympathised with the petitions of the Commons as to non-residence and pluralities.'³ It is true that the kings did not always themselves set a good example in the matter. But the legitimate grounds for objection against papal provisions are quite clear.⁴ 'Romanis enim innata est cupiditas,' said Gascoigne.

We may naturally connect with the low standard of clerical ideals revealed by these patronage scandals the strange lack of direct spiritual teaching during the period.

The neglect of preaching in the century before the Reformation is witnessed by many writers of the time. Gascoigne complained of Archbishop Arundel's provincial constitution, which restricted preaching to those who had the bishop's licence, and attributed his death to a judgment of God in consequence of his having tied the tongues of the clergy.⁵ Pecock defended this, and called the friars 'bawlers in the pulpits.' The bishops, indeed, do not seem ever to have expected or wished their clergy to preach much. The following is significant, though it belongs to the previous century:

'On June 24, 1385, the illustrious William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, caused Sir Roger Dene, rector of the Church of St. Michael, in Jewry Street, Winchester, to swear upon the Holy Gospels that he would learn within twelve months the articles of faith, the cases reserved to the bishop, the Ten Commandments, the seven works of mercy, the seven mortal sins, the Sacraments of the Church, and the form of administering and conferring them, and also the form of baptizing, &c., as contained in the Constitutions of

¹ The documents published by Mr. Powell and Mr. Trevelyan include a list of foreigners holding English preferments in 1377.

² See Capes, p. 160.

³ See Capes, pp. 169 sqq.

⁴ See Gascoigne, *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, pp. 21, 22, 36, 37.

⁵ *Loci e Libro Veritatum*, p. 34.

Archbishop Peckham. The same year (on July 2) the Bishop exacted from John Corbet, who had been instituted on June 2 previously to the rectory of Bradley in Hants, a similar obligation to learn the same before the Feast of St. Michael next ensuing.¹

Sermons from a rector who did not know what were the Ten Commandments or the Sacraments could hardly have been valuable. Archbishop Thoresby of York (*d.* 1373) commanded all his clergy who had cure of souls to 'preach openly in English upon Sundays,' and a sermon of his Englished by Dan John Gatryge is extant in more than one manuscript.² It is an instruction on Christian doctrine in the form of an explanation of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the seven sacraments, the seven works of mercy, the seven ghostly virtues, the seven head or deadly sins. Richard Rolle of Hampole (who died in 1349) made his first public claim to have entered upon the religious life as a hermit by preaching, with the parish priest's permission, a wonderful and touching sermon after the reading of the Gospel at Mass.³ That preaching was a recognized duty earlier in the history of the English Church is clear enough. The historians up to the fifteenth century bear frequent witness to it. But it seems equally clear that in the fifteenth century preaching was one of the obligations most often neglected. At the beginning of the century Wyclif's sermons show that the more eloquent parish priests constantly addressed their flocks. At its close the publication by Caxton of a book of sermons suggests that the clergy were in need of help to enable them to discharge their duties.

Dr. Gasquet has pointed out the fact that of the two hundred sermon-writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries whose names are known to us almost all are Carmelites.⁴ There is no doubt, indeed, that the mendicant orders continued preaching to the last. But of the parochial clergy it is much more difficult to judge. Caxton's *Liber Festivalis* (1483), derived from an earlier work, besides explanations of

¹ Gasquet, *The Old English Bible*, p. 188, note. We quote the words of a Roman Catholic that the statement may be above suspicion. Dr. Gasquet gives the facts as 'two curious instances of the care taken by the bishops to see that priests were able to instruct their people.'

² It is printed from Thornton MS., Lincoln Chapter Library, f. 213, and Arundel MS. 507, f. 50, by the Early English Text Society, 1867 (2nd edit.), edited by the late Archdeacon Perry.

³ See *Officium de S. Ricardo heremita* in preface to English prose treatises of Richard Rolle, edited by Archdeacon Perry (Early English Text Society, 1866), p. xviii. Some of these treatises are very likely sermons.

⁴ *The Old English Bible*, p. 222.

the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, has sermons for the period from Advent to Trinity, with several saints' day sermons.

'At the close of the fifteenth century the general popularity of the *Liber Festivalis* may be gauged by the fact that it was printed twice by Caxton, twice by Wynkyn de Worde, twice by Pynson, once by an English printer whose name is unknown in 1486, and thrice abroad before the close of the century.'¹

There could be no better proof of the need for sermons felt by clergy and people alike.

The contention as to preaching had at least this curious result. In 1458, when the king was at Coventry during Lent, it was ordered that no one should preach before the king whose sermon had not first passed the censorship,² but Master William Ive, B.D., refused to omit the passages which the censor condemned, and when he preached before the king made a sharp protest against the censorship. All the result was that he had his ride from Winchester for nothing, for the censor had control of the purse. It is not unlikely that Mr. Ive attacked the friars, for we find him later a sturdy opponent of their contention that Christ Himself 'was a beggar and had nought but by way of alms.'³ But neither censorship nor admonition seems to have made the preaching regular or the teaching even of the elements of the faith constant. Early in the sixteenth century the Archbishop of York was obliged to reiterate an order that the parish priests should four times in the year rehearse to their people without any fantastic subtilty the cardinal articles of Christian faith and morals.⁴

These two points seem to us at the least to illustrate the causes which brought about the Reformation. In the first place there was the constant growth of abuses connected with the authority exercised by the papal Curia; in the second there was the marked absence of direct teaching of the people. Popular the Church was, as we shall see, in many respects; but when her position was called in question, when moral dangers and intellectual difficulties came to be faced, as archbishops and scholars came to face them, the decay of preaching led to natural and often disastrous results. Men who had had no groundwork of Christian teaching

¹ *The Old English Bible*, p. 211.

² Gregory's *Chronicle* (Camden Society), p. 203, speaks mysteriously of the censor as A B C.

³ *Ibid.* p. 229.

⁴ Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 662. The date is doubtful.

instilled into them, who were unaccustomed to hear intellectual questions dealt with in the pulpit, fell inevitably into wild error when the Bible, often in a garbled translation, was put into their hands. That the Church in England had so nearly laid aside her preaching office was the cause of the rich crop of strange opinions that sprang up all over the land when the reforming movement began to have free course.

But when we have thus sketched some of the causes that were at work toward what became the Reformation of the Church, we have still to see how, at the end of the fifteenth century, such a movement became possible. Here Mr. Capes is practically silent. We will venture to answer for him that with the accession of the Tudors there came both a new age and two great men to direct its beginnings.

With the accession of Henry VII. we enter upon a new era of our national history. But we enter also upon a period for which it is difficult to acquire sufficient first-hand information. Briefly, the chroniclers have almost ceased to write, and the ambassadors have hardly begun. Our sources are chiefly Polydore Vergil, sub-collector of Peter's pence in England, a humanist none too scrupulous in his references to matters in which those whom he disliked were concerned, and Bernard André, an Augustinian friar attached in historic and poetic capacities to the court; the 'Italian Relation,' an account written probably during the first Venetian diplomatic mission to England; the royal letters; and the records of episcopal visitations of capitular and monastic bodies. For our purpose but little is added to these by the different London chronicles, and nothing by Lord Chancellor Bacon.

Yet none the less it is impossible to read the scanty records of the reign without feeling how great was its importance in the development of English life, and English thought, and English religion. To the comparative neglect with which modern historians of the Reformation have treated this critical reign we may well attribute the inadequacy of the reasons which they have assigned for that great movement. It is difficult to believe that the view that the *causa causans* of the separation from Rome was the so-called divorce of Henry VIII. would survive an exhaustive survey of the religious history of his father's reign. It is impossible to read the story of the years from 1485 to the end of the century without recognizing how clearly the old world was visibly passing away before men's eyes. Everywhere the national outlook was enlarged. Physically, when John Cabot re-discovered the North American continent in 1497, a dis-

covery out of which for the next half-century his son Sebastian made a handsome profit,¹ a new beginning was made for England's outlook abroad. Politically, the suppression of the rebellions of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck marked the end of the long period of dynastic warfare at home, and abroad Henry's appearance as mediator between France and Brittany in 1488, with his subsequent relations with the Emperor and with Spain, replaced the country among the European powers. His life-long aim, to 'set a brazen wall around his realm,' was so far accomplished that England was able, through the work he had initiated, to set about her ecclesiastical changes undisturbed by foreign interference. Politically, she was independent but not isolated. Intellectually, the reign of Henry VII. introduced England to the new learning of Italy and Germany. Ecclesiastically, it saw the beginning of the Reformation.

We have already seen that English feeling was ripe for a change in the position of the Church. The voice of Reformers, if it was silenced during the years of civil strife, was never forgotten. The Lollard party died away, but the principles of their leader had borne fruit in Bohemia, and it was only a question of time when the new seed should be carried oversea to find in England congenial soil. But the imminence of reform in England lay not in any philosophic opposition to mediæval theories, or in any heretical revolt from Catholic truth. It lay in the universal belief among intelligent men, clerk and lay, that the position of the monks and the mendicants in England was untenable, in the strong feeling of national independence which sprang to life under a new dynasty with expanding interests in politics and commerce. Reformation was certain, but it might never have involved that severance from the Papacy which became its chief historical feature. Reformation under Henry VII. could be foreseen, but severance from Rome was beyond the ken of the wisest.

Yet still the two causes which ultimately brought about the severance were already at work. These were the moral condition of the Papacy and the political independence of the English kings. Of neither of these causes need much be said here. Admitting to the full all that has been said on behalf of the Popes contemporary with Henry VII., it remains true

¹ The best estimate of the work actually done by the Cabots is that of Mr. C. R. Beazley, *John and Sebastian Cabot*, which makes clear how great was their influence on the development of English navigation and discovery.

that the careers of Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., and Julius II. were utterly out of harmony with the Christian ideal. Thus, when the principles which guided the private morals and the political actions of the Popes were applied, as it was inevitable they should be sooner or later, to the settlement of religious questions, it was inevitable that the conscience of a people already chafing under the abuse of holy things should revolt from the centre of Christian orthodoxy, where Satan might now seem to be enthroned. The political independence of the English Crown grew as rapidly under Henry VII. as did the corruption of the Roman Curia. At his death the first Tudor left his successor practically in the possession of absolute power within the 'brazen wall' he had built round the realm. If a king should join, for whatever motives, the moral revolt against the Papacy, it was clear that there was no power in England to stay him.

Henry VII.'s relations with the Popes were friendly.¹ Innocent VIII., in a bull of March 27, 1486, declared him king by an accumulated right, and sent him the golden sword and the highly adorned cap which were customary but trivial tokens of cordiality. Alexander VI. and Julius II. followed the example. Henry was an orthodox king, inclined to haggle over trade matters with the Holy See, and insistent, when it came to be a serious matter, as in the case of dispensations, on having his own way. He was personally a religious man, scrupulous in the performance of his duties. He heard Mass daily, and it was his habit also to attend evensong.² As for his personal character, he had been brought up by a good mother, to whom he was always grateful, and even submissive. He was a faithful husband, and, according to the standard of his time, a kind father. But, like most Englishmen of his day, he had only a very slight feeling of family affection; marriage was to him a bargain, looked at only in its material or its physical aspect. Yet he was far superior as a man and as a king to James IV., whom the Popes treated with at least equal consideration. It is not surprising that they should have been easy in the matter of dispensations for the English king, when they allowed his cousin of Scotland to give the highest prelacies to his illegitimate children.³

Of the position he held abroad as a strong Christian

¹ Cf. Bern. Andrea, *Vita*, pp. 46, 84, 86.

² See the interesting contemporary account of the reception of Philip, King of Castile, at Windsor in 1506 (printed in Bern. Andrea, *Vita*, pp. 282 sqq.)

³ Cf. *Letters and Papers of Henry VII.* vol. ii. *passim*.

prince, the letter of the Knights of Rhodes, May 1506, in which they create him protector of their order, is an instance;¹ and he was always ready to discuss with the Popes the familiar subject of a crusade against the Turks. Such was the king in whose hands had arisen a strong and independent power.

Apart from the other reasons which enable us to foresee under Henry VII. the imminence of a reformation of the English Church, the absolutism which had been established, with the almost complete acquiescence of the people, was evidence that the authority of the Crown was strong enough to go a long way towards the realization of any scheme on which the king might set his heart. It was the universal impression of foreign observers that Henry VII. was stronger than any of his predecessors, that he ruled as he willed, and that the people loved to have it so. This was the result of a carefully elaborated policy, constitutional, economic, religious. Henry was masterful, rich, prudent; and when he died he held the forces of the kingdom in the hollow of his hand.

But Henry had not stood alone; and from the point of view which we are now taking it is important to observe that his chief minister during the most critical part of his reign was an ecclesiastic as well as a statesman, a man keenly alive to all the new interests of the age, and most of all eager to purge the scandals of the Church.

John Morton, who rose to be Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord High Chancellor of England, was a man of remarkable power. The struggles and dangers of his early life had left their traces on his mind, though not on 'the amiable reverence' of his face. Sir Thomas More's beautiful description of him in his old age shows us a man alert and vigorous to the last, kindly, learned, 'in wit incomparable.' His public work, sometimes leading, as Bishop Stubbs has reminded us, to strange confusions of function—as when, as Chancellor, in sentencing a fraudulent debtor, he reminded him that he would also be *dampné en helle*—was largely financial and social. His expedients collected up the great treasure of Henry VII.; his active works of building and of irrigation show the practical bent of his mind.

He was one of the last great ecclesiastical statesmen of England. When the higher clergy were constantly employed in politics there is no need for wonder that they were not all loyal to the Crown. In 1494 and 1495 many ecclesiastics were shown to have been implicated among the favourers of

¹ *Letters and Papers of Henry VII.* i. 287–88.

Warbeck. The Dean of St. Paul's and the Provincial of the Dominicans were actually brought to trial, and many more were known to have escaped detection. The growth of a strong feeling against political prelates is obvious during the reign of Henry VII. From the murders of 1450, indeed, down to the dismissal of Wolsey, the public distaste for the rule of clerks was constantly rising; and Henry VIII. in nothing more clearly interpreted the wishes of his people than when he ceased to employ ecclesiastics in the highest offices of state. The Renaissance, because it widened the area of learning, and the Reformation, because it taught above all things that the clergy should mind the things of the Spirit, ended the age of ecclesiastic ministers in England.

But Morton was in many respects an excellent representative of the class. He was pious, energetic, sagacious, unselfish. It was impossible that such a man should be blind to the evils of the Church in his day. It was equally impossible that he should leave them without an attempt at cure. To his work, then, let us turn.

The register of the archbishop contains many details of the state of religion and the urgent need of reformation. From the minor matters of clerical dandyism, the abandoning of the tonsure and the wearing of swords and jewels and gorgeous apparel, and the neglect of pastoral duties and of residence,¹ we have ample evidence of the Church's wants and the archbishop's activity. But the climax is reached when we read the Primate's monition to the Abbot of St. Albans. Fortified by a bull of Innocent VIII., *pro reformatione monasteriorum et locorum exemptorum*,² which spoke of the dissolute lives of many of the religious and gave to the archbishop full power of visitation, Morton addressed the abbot with a sternness which his crimes but too clearly justified. He declared, as a matter beyond dispute, that he allowed the most holy places to be stained with blood and lust, and he named an adulteress as admitted by the abbot to the nunnery at Pray, advanced to be sub-prioress, and then permitted to live in sin with the monks. With righteous indignation he spoke of the sin and scandal, and ordered an immediate and thorough reformation.³ If this were an isolated instance of depravity we might be willing to pass it by in silence, but the

¹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 619, 620.

² *Ibid.* pp. 630-32.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 632-34. Cf. with this Wolsey's ordinances against the admission of women to monasteries (Wilkins, iii. 685). These were issued in 1519.

statute 1 Hen. VII. c. 4 is a sufficient proof that the corruption was widespread. This act expressly declared that it should be lawful for the bishops to punish all priests and clerks within their jurisdiction who should be proved guilty of fleshly incontinency, by imprisonment proportionate to their offence, and that no action should lie against them for this.¹

The archbishop's visitations of many of the dioceses in his province show his determination to suppress all disorders and to exercise to the full his authority, both that inherent in his metropolitan office, and that derived from papal authority as legate.² He did not go far enough, Mr. Capes thinks. The Abbot of St. Albans was only admonished, not deposed. Grosseteste would have done more. Morton 'dealt with the symptoms rather than the causes of the evils of a demoralized Church, provided for discipline rather than for freedom, for decorum more than for the enthusiasm of spiritual life.'³ But what other steps could he have taken than those of investigation and coercion which he adopted? Would he have done better if he had acted more sharply still? It is difficult to believe that he would. It was necessary to proceed cautiously. Reformation, not disestablishment or disendowment, was the need of the hour; and methods too precipitate might ruin all.

The very interesting chapter in which Mr. Capes treats of the monastic life covers too long a period to be of special value for the epoch we are now considering. A bird's-eye view which stretches over more than two centuries does not afford an accurate or complete picture of any one reign. But the facts are well known.

'The significance of the fact that probably only one new monastic house was founded in the fifteenth century has often been noted. Whatever may have been the moral condition of the monasteries, it is clear that they were not popular. There were too many of them, and they held too much land, and they did not know how to farm it according to modern methods.'⁴

Thus it was natural that new endowments should not flow in. Benefactors thought of the learned rather than of the religious life; and, as has been said, they did not hesitate

¹ If this act were still enforced it might be a just treatment of the few scandals which still remain.

² Parker, *De Antig. Eccl.* p. 447; Rymer, *Fædera*, xii. 574.

³ *History of Engl. Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 203; cf. p. 301.

⁴ *Church Quarterly Review*, No. xcvi. p. 424.

on behalf of one to suppress the other. So Waynflete and Alcock prepared the way for Wolsey, and Wolsey taught Henry VIII.

The great country-houses of the monastic orders in the fifteenth century visibly decayed. No longer was the old hospitality kept up. It was, indeed, often impossible, for many of the houses were impoverished. At St. Albans, where once there had been stabling for three hundred horses, now nobles and great men stayed at 'The George,' and the abbey found its only remunerative compensation in granting a licence to that hostelry to have an oratory of its own. At Abingdon the abbey hospice was replaced in 1414 by an inn leased from the abbey, with licence from Henry IV.¹

The conventual life, it is undeniable, was

'becoming more earthly and self-centred. The monks had no missionary enthusiasm; stirred no thrill of enthusiasm by the ascetic rigour of their rule; their estates were leased to tenant farmers; they had ceased to introduce new methods, or import fresh products. Their interest in history was dying out; their hospitality was being shifted on the landlords of neighbouring inns; their almsgiving took the most wasteful and unwise forms of indiscriminate doles.'

So says Mr. Capes. But his picture is hardly complete.

Gregory's *Chronicle* (the author died at the end of 1465) gives a list of the churches and monasteries in London in his time,² which throws considerable light on the work which was still done by the religious houses in populous places. The care of the sick, the infirm, and the insane was in the hands of the religious, and many hospitals and monasteries were richly endowed for works of mercy. St. Thomas's and St. Bartholomew's were for 'pore men and wymmen,' Bedlam for those 'that ben fallyn owte of hyr wytte.' There was provision for penitent women, for aged and impotent men, as well as for blind and lame. 'The charities of the Middle Ages were perhaps not more redundant or more misapplied than those of our own day, and many of them were eminently beneficial,' says our great authority on the fifteenth century.³ Practical philanthropy was indeed coming forward prominently at the close of the Middle Ages. Henry VII. himself built the Savoy Hospital in London, and designed to build one also for a hundred poor folk at Bath.

¹ Mr. Capes (p. 287) notes this, but prints Henry I. for Henry IV.

² This Mr. Gairdner compares with those in Fabian's *Chronicle*, pp. 295-8, and Arnold's *Chronicle*, pp. 75-7. [*Collections of a London Citizen*, Camden Society, Introd. p. viii.]

³ Dr. James Gairdner, *op. cit.* p. x.

These were active works for the public good, which forbid us to say with Mr. Capes that the monks 'did very little for the service of the outer world.' Why, indeed, need the abbeys entertain rich folk who could well afford to pay? Were their endowments given for such a purpose? Such arguments no doubt the monks used; but they could not avail against the obvious riches of the great houses, and the fact that these were not well employed. The number of religious houses struck an Italian observer as prodigious, and their riches as proportionate. He mentions the abbot of Glastonbury and the abbess of Shaftesbury as among the richest, and says that it is an English saying that 'the finest marriage that could be made in England would be between that abbot and abbess!'¹

'Above all,' says the *Venetian Relation*,² 'are their riches displayed in the church treasures; for there is not a parish church in the kingdom so mean as not to possess crucifixes, candlesticks, censers, patens, and chalices of silver; nor is there a convent of mendicant friars so poor as not to have all these same articles in silver, besides many other ornaments worthy of a cathedral church in the same metal.'

He adds that the rich monasteries are more like baronial than religious houses.

It is statements such as these, at first sight so difficult to reconcile with accounts of economic failure, which give the clue to the real position of the monasteries in the fifteenth century. The smaller houses were generally poor and ill-governed, but they still possessed great treasures of plate and church furniture. The greater houses were rich, but not rich as of old. Their treasures remained, but their lands were less valuable. Most prominent of all, the lives of their inhabitants were more self-indulgent. It is quaint, indeed, to observe the anxiety of the last abbot of Glastonbury to preserve his hunting rights. The letters he wrote to Thomas Cromwell when his fall was drawing nearer and nearer show a curious and rather petty irritation at any infringement of his sporting privileges. Martyr he may have been, but he was certainly a sportsman to the last.³

When we seek to estimate the actual influence exercised by the clergy and by the monks on English life in the

¹ *Venetian Relation*, pp. 40-1.

² *Ibid.* p. 29.

³ Compare the article on 'Richard Whiting' in the *Dictionary of National Biography* with Dom Gasquet's somewhat trivial and one-sided *Life*.

fifteenth century, it may be well that we should not neglect such sidelights as are thrown by the sporting instincts of the ecclesiastical estate. The hunting parson was certainly no invention of the eighteenth century. 'The cassock'd huntsman and the fiddling priest' were as well known to the observers of the Middle Ages as to William Cowper himself; and they won, in each age, a sort of spurious popularity which was not of the slightest service to them when the day of danger came and they were put to the test. In the country districts the encroachments of the monastic houses were bitterly resented,¹ and the people were ready enough to espouse the cause of the parochial clergy, on whose action the success of the Reformation ultimately depended.

The breaking down of celibacy rules did not decrease the Church's popularity in the country. That marriage of the clergy had long continued in spite of church custom abroad and papal enactment is clear from a passage in Gascoigne's *Liber Veritatum*.² Bishop De la Bere, 'of detestable memory,' Gascoigne calls him—he never went near his diocese—was beset by his clergy, who besought him that he would compel their wives to depart from them; but he refused, saying that he would lose four hundred marks by it, for each of the priests paid him a noble a year for his wife. It is quite certain that many of the clergy in the fifteenth century were actually married.

'Canon law might regard the union as concubinage, but it was not otherwise illegal, though steps could be taken to make it void. Bishops denounced it as an unholy thing; the prohibitions of it were to be read in the ruridecanal chapters four times a year, that the threats of deprivation might be known to all concerned. It was ruled that a priest's son must not be allowed to succeed him in his cure, that suspected women must be put away, or refused the sacraments of the Church. Bishop Quivil of Exeter complained that the savings of the clergy were often invested by them for the benefit of their lifelong partners, for the dying thought tenderly of them in their last moments, and he ruled all bequests made to them to be null and void. The episcopal powers of sequestration and the regulation of the courts made it easy to carry out the coercion thus enjoined, but it was a very questionable gain. Illicit marriages perhaps became less frequent, but when temporary connections took their place the scandal was far graver, and the effect upon the moral character much worse. The authorities, however, seemed less earnest in such cases, and the penal discipline was not severe.'³

¹ Cf. Gascoigne, *Liber Veritatum*, p. 197.

² P. 35. Even Mr. Thorold Rogers thought this story 'a little coloured,' but there can be no doubt that it has a basis of truth.

³ Capes, *op. cit.* p. 257.

The facts that suspension was rare, and that deprivation was scarcely heard of for such offences, throw a curious light on the state of society. It may almost certainly be inferred that clerical marriage—or concubinage, as it was called—was not unpopular, and that it would have been impossible to enforce severe penalties against it. All this refers chiefly to the country districts. In the towns there was a higher moral standard, and it cannot be said that this told against the clergy.

In the towns it is clear enough that the Church was popular. Few of the ecclesiastical edifices were without substantial additions, and the records of many parishes contain accounts of contributions for church work. Thus in the rolls of St. Lawrence, Reading, we have a list of subscribers *ad opus ecclesie* in 1440, in which individual subscriptions range from 6s. 8d., 3s. 4d. (the vicar), 2s. (the M.P. for Reading), down to twopence.¹ So later on there are many references to alterations and improvements in which the parishioners are interested, as in 1510: 'Paid for the cleansing of the images of the rood-loft at request of the parish, 2s. 8d.' In the same way, there can be no doubt, pew-rents originated. Sir Thomas More has references to the custom of seeking out and paying for good places; but it appears from what he says, and from the accounts of St. Lawrence, Reading, that they were reserved in some places only for women. From the latter there is this quaint statement: '1515-6. Also it is agreed that all women that shall take any seat in the said church do pay for the same seat 6d., except in the middle range and the north range beneath the font, the which shall pay but 4d., and that every woman do take her place every day as they cometh to church, except such as have been mayors' wives.' Later on wives of the brethren of the Mass of Jesus were given the 'highest seats or pews next unto the mayors' wives.' Similar entries occur in the churchwardens' accounts of the churches of St. Edmund and St. Thomas, Sarum, but there pews are reserved also, though rarely, for men. Considerable sums were obtained in this way. The men seem to have always been seated separately from the women.

At the church of St. Lawrence, Reading, there were in 1523 at least seven altars. Six of these were sold in 1549. Under Philip and Mary five new altars were hallowed. These were removed early in Elizabeth's reign.²

¹ Cf. *Accounts of St. Edmund and St. Thomas, Sarum* (Wilts Record Society, 1896), where there is throughout the fifteenth century an annual entry of *dona et legata, ad opera ecclesie*.

² See *History of St. Lawrence, Reading* (the Municipal Church), by the Rev. C. Kerry, 1883.

Instances such as these, and we have been careful to observe that they are continuous, confirm the evidence afforded by the great parish churches. The fifteenth century, whatever else may be said of it, was really great in church-building. The Perpendicular style, with its delight in breadth and dignity, was essentially a popular style. Beginning towards the end of the fourteenth century in the choir of Gloucester Cathedral, it lasted till the very end of the Middle Ages. Its culminating glory came at the very time when Morton was endeavouring to reform the Church, and when the Venetian observer was noticing with astonishment both the extraordinary richness of the parish churches and the remarkable devotion of the people.

Of the architecture of Henry VII.'s reign it is not possible here to say much; but it is impossible to pass by the evidence which is afforded by the magnificent churches erected at the end of the fifteenth century to the riches and the popularity of the churches. The king's own chapel at Westminster, one of the richest and most magnificent examples of the Perpendicular style, is the fit monument of his dignity and of his attachment to the Church in her material aspect. Windsor too, as well as Cambridge and Oxford, show splendid work, inspired by the same desire for magnificence and pride which is so characteristic of this age of the Church's history. Nor can any county of England be traversed by the wayfarer which does not display still, in strength which has almost always defied the hand of time, the affection and the riches of a people devoted to their national Church. The lands where the woolstaplers flourished are most abundant in these relics of the age before the Reformation, and it is not easy, perhaps, in any country district to discover three finer buildings of the same date within easy distance of each other than the parish churches of Fairford, Northleach, and Chipcampden.

Of the Church's popularity among the townsfolk, then, there can hardly be any doubt. There is scarce a trace of the invective which had come so readily in the days of Wyclif. The clergy seemed at the top of the tide. The Venetian observer considered that it was they who had 'supreme sway over the country both in peace and war';¹ and the devotion of the people seemed to secure the continuance of their power.

¹ Although they all attend Mass every day, and say many Paternosters in public (the women carrying long rosaries in their hands,

¹ *Venetian Relation*, p. 34.

The

THE
subj
such
of T
War,

¹ 1
² 2
of the
terly

and any who can read taking the Office of our Lady with them, and with some companion reciting it in the church verse by verse in a low voice, after the manner of the religious), they always hear Mass on Sunday in their parish church, and give liberal alms, because they may not offer less than a piece of money of which fourteen are equivalent to a golden ducat; nor do they omit any form incumbent on good Christians; there are nevertheless many who have various opinions concerning religion.¹

The last words of this acute observer reveal something of what was to come. If Wyclif's teaching had entirely died out, there were still 'various opinions' afloat among the people. Nothing could be more delusive than to trace the English Reformation to Luther.² Its causes—intellectual, moral, spiritual—were at work long before he was born. They were found in the abuses—'gross as a mountain, open, palpable'—which had been growing century by century as the hold of the Popes grew tighter. Legislation had failed to deal with the evil. The attempts of reforming prelates were little more successful. But neither had been altogether in vain. Public opinion was slowly being educated to see how gross were the scandals, and how essential it was to remedy them if religion in England was not utterly to decay. The intellectual movement at the end of the fifteenth century, quite apart from Protestantism, gave voice to the national discontent. The absorption of all the powers of the State in the hands of a strong king gave the opportunity. Henry VIII., as Dr. Gairdner has written, 'opened the flood-gates: then the stream could flow.'

ART. VI.—LECKY'S 'MAP OF LIFE.'

The Map of Life: Conduct and Character. By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. Second Impression. (London, 1899.)

THE title of this book suggests that it deals with many subjects. And to turn over its pages at haphazard is to see such headings as 'Newman on Venial Sin,' 'Insufficiency of Theological Formulæ,' 'What Weapons may be Used in War,' 'Technicalities Defeating Justice,' 'The Ethics of Party,'

¹ *Venetian Relation*, p. 23.

² As does Dom Gasquet in his singularly incomplete sketch, *The Eve of the Reformation*. For further criticism of this book see *Church Quarterly Review*, No. c. pp. 405-29.

'The Scientific Spirit and Theology,' 'Relations of Money to Happiness,' 'Pagan View of Death,' confirming the idea of its wide scope. Yet a perusal of it shows that its many subjects are treated with great skill, and that it forms a consistent whole, the object of which is to consider how human happiness may best be promoted.

The Map of Life is evidently the outcome of long and careful thought. But it is clear that very much of it has been recently written. It has the freshness which is given by apt references to events which lately happened. There is a word of disapproval of the action of Lord Salisbury's Government with regard to vaccination (p. 133). The expediency of the foundation of a Roman Catholic University for Ireland is allowed under existing circumstances (pp. 134-7). A paragraph in the chapter dealing with party politics was apparently penned in view of the alliance between Conservatives and Liberal Unionists (pp. 142-3). Reference is made to the Armenian massacres and the visit of 'the sovereign of one of the greatest and most civilized of Christian nations' 'to Constantinople to clasp the hand which was so deeply dyed with Christian blood,' and 'to the Mount of Olives' to proclaim himself 'with melodramatic piety the champion and the patron of the Christian faith' (p. 179). To the description of the 'Jameson raid into the Transvaal' as 'one of the most discreditable as well as mischievous events in recent colonial history,' with a 'character' 'entirely unrelieved by any gleam either of heroism or of skill,' there are added some outspoken remarks about 'the statesman who' 'prepared and organized the expedition against the Transvaal' (p. 173). 'It may be acknowledged,' it is there said,

'that, although Mr. Rhodes had made an enormous fortune by mining speculations, and although he was largely interested as a financier in overturning the system of government at Johannesburg, he was not a man likely to be actuated by mere love of money, and that political ambition closely connected with the opening and the civilization of Africa largely actuated him. . . . What, however, he did has been very clearly established. When holding the highly confidential position of Prime Minister of the Cape Colony, and being at the same time a Privy Councillor of the Queen, he engaged in a conspiracy for the overthrow of the Government of a neighbouring and friendly State. In order to carry out this design he deceived the High Commissioner whose Prime Minister he was. He deceived his own colleagues in the Ministry. He collected under false pretences a force which was intended to co-operate with an insurrection in Johannesburg. Being a director of the Chartered Company he made use of that position without the knowledge of his

colleagues to further the conspiracy. He took an active and secret part in smuggling great quantities of arms into the Transvaal, which were intended to be used in the rebellion, and at a time when his organs in the press were representing Johannesburg as seething with spontaneous indignation against an oppressive government, he, with another millionaire, was secretly expending many thousands of pounds in that town in stimulating and subsidising the rising. He was also directly connected with the shabbiest incident in the whole affair—the concoction of a letter from the Johannesburg conspirators absurdly representing English women and children at Johannesburg as in danger of being shot down by the Boers, and urging the British to come at once to save them. . . . What can be thought of the language of a Minister who volunteered to assure the House of Commons that in all the transactions I have described, Mr. Rhodes, though he had made "a gigantic mistake," a mistake perhaps as great as a statesman could make, had done nothing affecting his personal honour?' (pp. 174-7).

Nor does the opportuneness of this most interesting book consist merely in such passing references and illustrations as we have just mentioned. The subjects themselves of which the distinguished author treats are those which are at the present time very prominent in the minds of thinking men. The troubles in South Africa, the outbreak in China, and the general sense of strain about European affairs, have forced very many to ponder those difficult questions about war which are never far from the minds of a few. And to those who believe that between the fancy that war is the most glorious of occupations and the idea that it is the worst of evils there is room for a reasonable position which, while allowing to the full the terrible injuries which war inflicts on human character as well as on property and life, can recognize also that it may sometimes lie in the course of duty, and may even be used as a strengthening and ennobling influence, there is much which will be welcome in Mr. Lecky's book. It has not, indeed, fallen within the province he has marked out for himself to afford a detailed discussion on this subject which might be ranked with the profound treatment of it which characterizes the magnificent sermon preached by Dr. Mozley in 1871,¹ or the brilliant address delivered by Mr. Aubrey Moore at the Church Congress of 1885.² Within his chosen limits he says much which is helpful. There is need of the protest against that 'perverted public opinion' which bestows 'passionate admiration' 'on a brilliant conqueror, which is often quite

¹ Sermon v. in Mozley, *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford and on various occasions.*

² Moore, *Essays Scientific and Philosophical*, pp. 218-29.

irrespective of the justice of his wars and of the motives that actuated him' (p. 61). Those who are convinced of the justice of the English cause in South Africa, and of the high and honourable character of the motives by which the English commanders are actuated, and who moreover ungrudgingly admire the heroism which in some notable instances has lately been shown, may still find cause for suspicion and regret in the spirit which marks many of the newspapers and much of the conversation of to-day. For it is difficult not to be conscious of a lust of conquest and a disregard of right which would have applauded an unjust war of aggression hardly, if at all, less warmly than the unavoidable conflict in which we have been engaged. And, to pass by for the moment the valuable chapter which deals with 'Moral Compromise in War,' we may quote two passages which afford much food for thought :

'It was once the custom of a large school of writers to attribute unjust wars solely to the rulers of the world who for their own selfish ambition remorselessly sacrificed the lives of tens of thousands of their subjects. Their guilt has been very great, but they would never have pursued the course of ambitious conquest if the applause of nations had not followed and encouraged them ; and there are no signs that democracy, which has enthroned the masses, has any real tendency to diminish war. . . . Those who will look on the world without illusion will be compelled to admit that the chief guarantees for its peace are to be found much less in moral than in purely selfish motives. The financial embarrassments of the great nations ; their profound distrust of one another ; the vast cost of modern war ; the gigantic commercial disasters it inevitably entails ; the extreme uncertainty of its issue ; the utter ruin that may follow defeat—these are the real influences that restrain the tiger passions and the avaricious cravings of mankind. . . . What trust could be placed in the forbearance of Christian nations if the path of aggression was at once easy, lucrative, and safe ? . . . No great nation is blameless, and there is probably no nation that could not speedily catch the infection of the warlike spirit, if a conqueror and a few splendid victories obscured, as they nearly always do, the moral issues of the conflict.

'War, it is true, is not always or wholly evil. Sometimes it is justifiable and necessary. Sometimes it is professedly and in part really due to some strong wave of philanthropic feeling produced by great acts of wrong, though of all forms of philanthropy it is that which most naturally defeats itself. Even when unjustifiable, it calls into action splendid qualities of courage, self-sacrifice, and endurance which cast a dazzling and deceptive glamour over its horrors and its criminality' (pp. 77-8).

'The temptations of party politicians are of many kinds and vary greatly with different stages of political development. The worst is the temptation to war. War undertaken without necessity, or at

least without serious justification, is, according to all sound ethics, the gravest of crimes, and among its causes motives of the kind I have indicated may be often detected. Many wars have been begun or have been prolonged in order to consolidate a dynasty or a party; in order to give it popularity, or at least to save it from unpopularity; in order to divert the minds of men from internal questions which had become dangerous or embarrassing, or to efface the memory of past quarrels, mistakes, or crimes. Experience unfortunately shows only too clearly how easily the combative passions of nations can be aroused, and how much popularity may be gained by a successful war' (pp. 143-4).

All this, we repeat, has its special value at the present time. Our conviction of the justice and necessity of the war in South Africa does not lessen the gravity of our fear that there is a very dangerous tendency strongly and widely at work in English public feeling.

As instances of the opportuneness of *The Map of Life*, we may notice also the allusion Mr. Lecky makes to the fact that 'the love of individual liberty has' 'rapidly' 'declined' 'during the past generation' (p. 16), and his excellent remarks on the relations between 'the diminution of disease and the prolongation of average human life' and an 'improvement in general health' (pp. 14-5).

Questions connected with almsgiving are a perpetual puzzle to many minds. The difficulty of ascertaining real needs, the danger on the one hand of encouraging idleness and sin, and on the other hand of sacrificing human beings to system, the risk of careful calculation and thought in the administration of charity leading to hardness and loss of sympathetic temper—these form parts of a great problem as to the solution of which there can be very few thinking men who are really satisfied. Here, again, Mr. Lecky supplies much which is helpful. He points out that 'lavish and ill-considered charities' are often due to selfish indolence (p. 35); shortly describes with great skill some of the more common forms of 'useless' and 'mischievous' 'charities' (pp. 269-70); and makes valuable suggestions as to the profitable employment of money in real benevolence (pp. 270-1). No amount of theory will ever supply a complete practical rule in this matter; when all has been said, individual cases must still be treated as individual cases; room must be left for the personal exercise of sympathy as well as for the administration of system; the Christian duty of almsgiving cannot be fully carried out by any rule of thumb. But of what can be said in the way of theory there is an admirable presentation in the pages to which we have referred.

There is an excellent chapter entitled 'The Management of Character.' It allows sufficiently for natural disposition and for the results of training. It is full of shrewd observations and lit up by brilliant expression. For the details of what Mr. Lecky says on this important subject, we must refer our readers to the book itself. There is one passage from the chapter which we wish to quote in view of its bearing on the over-pressure of education on children which we believe to be common.

'Passions weaken,' it is there said, 'but habits strengthen with age, and it is the great task of youth to set the current of habit, and to form the tastes which are the most productive of happiness in life. Here, as in most other things, opposite exaggerations are to be avoided. There is such a thing as looking forward too rigidly and exclusively to the future—to a future that may never arrive. This is the great fault of the over-educationist, who makes early life a burden and a toil, and also of those who try to impose on youth the tastes and pleasures of the man. Youth has its own pleasures, which will always give it most enjoyment, and a happy youth is in itself an end. It is the time when the power of enjoyment is most keen, and it is often accompanied by such extreme sensitiveness that the sufferings of the child for what seem the most trivial causes probably at least equal in acuteness, though not in durability, the sufferings of a man. Many a parent standing by the coffin of his child has felt with bitterness how much of the measure of enjoyment that short life might have known has been cut off by an injudicious education. And even if adult life is attained, the evils of an unhappy childhood are seldom wholly compensated. The pleasures of retrospect are among the most real we possess, and it is around our childish days that our fondest associations naturally cluster. An early over-strain of our powers often leaves behind it lasting distortion or weakness, and a sad childhood introduces into the character elements of morbidness and bitterness that will not disappear' (p. 223).

We have quoted this passage, as we have said, for a particular purpose. Side by side with an immense amount of idleness and that exaggerated attention to athletics of which Mr. Lecky writes (pp. 224-5) with great justice, over-pressure in education is lamentably common. It is too often forgotten in both preparatory and public schools that the boy who wins the best scholarship at a public school or at one of the universities may do so at the cost of strain which will manifest itself in later life, and that a high place in the university class lists may be very dearly purchased. Faculties of judgment which might be trained and developed are often sacrificed to the accumulation of knowledge of a kind and in a form which will afford immediate results; the brain is over-exerted in

childhood and youth to an extent which hinders its proper development and leads through apparent success to a life and career which are deprived of the full usefulness they ought to possess. Our really great teachers are fully alive to the dangers of pressure at too early an age, and of wrong methods in the training of so sensitive and intricate an organ as the brain. There are very many engaged in education, and perhaps chiefly in preparatory schools, who appear to disregard these dangers almost recklessly.

We need not linger over the chapter on 'Marriage,' admirable as it is. But we may quote two short passages which are valuable in themselves, and are in their force and tone representative of the chapter as a whole:

'Strength may wed with weakness or with strength, but weakness should beware of mating itself with weakness. It needs the oak to support the ivy with impunity, and there are many who find the constant contact of a happy and cheerful nature the first essential of their happiness' (p. 290).

'Nor is it desirable that a relation in which the formation of habits plays so large a part should be deferred until character has lost its flexibility, and until habits have been irretrievably hardened' (p. 292).¹

We must not dwell on political topics so fascinating as those raised by Mr. Lecky's expression of opinion that the 'masterpiece of unscrupulous adroitness' by which Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, 'succeeded in inducing his party to carry a measure far more democratic than that which they had a few months before denounced and defeated,' was designed to give effect to 'the genuine convictions' which led him to believe that 'a strong executive resting on a broad democratic basis was the true future of Toryism' (p. 140), and his condemnation of 'the Irish land legislation which was begun by the Ministry of Mr. Gladstone, but which has been largely extended by the party that originally most strenuously opposed it' (p. 148).

A large part of the book is occupied by the consideration of 'moral compromise.' This matter is dealt with at length in relation to war, law, politics, and the teaching and practice of the Church. Before entering upon this detailed discussion

¹ We regret that, in view of possible misunderstanding, Mr. Lecky has not added to what he well says in condemnation of 'excessive child-bearing' and bringing 'children into the world with no prospect of being able to provide for them' (pp. 285-6) a few words which might have emphasized that the only right way of avoiding the evils to which he refers is that of self-control.

Mr. Lecky devotes a few pages to the subject in general, and asserts the practical necessity of such compromise. The doctrine he quotes from Cardinal Newman that—

'it were better for sun and moon to drop from heaven, for the earth to fail, and for all the many millions who are upon it to die of starvation in extremest agony, so far as temporal affliction goes, than that one soul, I will not say should be lost, but should commit one single venial sin, should tell one wilful untruth, though it harmed no one, or steal one poor farthing without excuse'¹—

'would,' he says, 'lead to consequences absolutely incompatible with any life outside a hermitage or a monastery,' and 'would strike at the root of all civilization' (p. 83). 'Hardly any sane man'

'would desire to suppress Bank Holidays simply because they are the occasion of a considerable number of cases of drunkenness which would not otherwise have taken place. No humane legislator would hesitate to suppress them if they produced an equal number of deaths or other great physical calamities' (p. 85).

Referring to 'the many untruths which the conventional courtesies of society prescribe,' he proceeds:

'Some of these are so purely matter of phraseology that they deceive no one. Others chiefly serve the purpose of courteous concealment, as when they enable us to refuse a request, or to decline an invitation or a visit without disclosing whether disinclination or inability is the cause. Then there are falsehoods for useful purposes. Few men would shrink from a falsehood which was the only means of saving a patient from a shock which would probably produce his death. No one, I suppose, would hesitate to deceive a criminal if by no other means he could prevent him from accomplishing a crime. There are also cases of the suppression of what we believe to be true, and of tacit or open acquiescence in what we believe to be false, when a full and truthful disclosure of our own beliefs might destroy the happiness of others, or subvert beliefs which are plainly necessary for their moral well-being' (p. 86).

There are two criticisms which occur to us on what Mr. Lecky has thus written on the general subject of 'moral compromise.' In the first place, he does not appear to realize that the truth upon which Cardinal Newman was insisting in the lecture from which he quotes is that of the absolute importance of moral goodness and the relative unimportance of any temporal gain. It certainly would not follow from the fact that Bank Holidays 'are the occasion of a considerable number of cases of drunkenness which would not otherwise

¹ Quoted from Newman's *Anglican Difficulties*, p. 190.

have taken place' that they ought to be suppressed. But, if it should be shown that Bank Holidays in their full results produce more moral harm than moral goodness, that, when the help they afford through rest and change to the living of a virtuous life has been completely reckoned, it is overbalanced by the dangers to virtue which they involve, it would certainly be the duty of a Christian to desire, and to aim at bringing about, their discontinuance. It is not only the teaching of the Church which is committed to this belief. It is implied in the words of our Lord Himself:

'Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on Me to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire. And if thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life halt, rather than having thy two feet to be cast into hell. And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, cast it out: it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'

And, in the second place, the illustrations used by Mr. Lecky appear to show the existence of a confusion in his mind as to what is really sin. If the 'untruths' and 'falsehoods' to which he refers are sins, it follows that they are forbidden by the Christian religion. But it is not the case that a statement verbally untrue is in all instances what the Christian religion describes as a lie. Mr. Lecky himself mentions the 'untruths' which 'are so purely matter of phraseology that they deceive no one;' but he does not appear to see what is really involved in this admission. Everyone knows that such a phrase as 'regret' in the answer to an invitation is a mere conventional expression which means nothing; everyone knows that the phrase 'not at home' in the reply of a servant to a visitor means 'not at home to receive your visit,' and implies nothing whatever as regards physical presence, just as the enquiry 'Is so-and-so at home?' does not mean 'Is he in the house?' but 'Is he able and willing to receive a visit?' Underneath the common use of such phraseology lies the fact that it is not within the rights of everyone to require an answer to everything he may please to ask. The intending murderer has no right to the information which will enable him to commit the murder.

¹ St. Mark ix. 42-8.

The patient who has placed himself in a doctor's hands has no right to the knowledge which it is against his interests to gain. In such cases an answer which misleads the person to whom it is addressed is not a lie. The right inference from Mr. Lecky's illustrations is not that a compromise by which sin is committed is sometimes lawful, but that his instances are not those of commission of sin.

After the introductory remarks on which we have commented, Mr. Lecky discusses 'moral compromise' in war.

'A large and difficult field of moral compromise,' he says, 'is opened out in the case of war, which necessarily involves a complete suspension of great portions of the moral law. This is not merely the case in unjust wars; it applies also, though in a less degree, to those which are most necessary and most righteous. War is not, and never can be, a mere passionless discharge of a painful duty. It is in its essence, and it is a main condition of its success, to kindle into fierce exercise among great masses of men the destructive and combative passions—passions as fierce and as malevolent as that with which the hound hunts the fox to its death, or the tiger springs upon its prey. Destruction is one of its chief ends. Deception is one of its chief means, and one of the great arts of skilful generalship is to deceive in order to destroy' (pp. 86-7).

Neither in this passage nor in the following pages in which Mr. Lecky draws out and illustrates his position with great power do we think that the phrase 'moral compromise' is rightly used. Granted that a war may be entered on at all, deception in the course of it cannot be regarded as sin; because it is understood on both sides that he who can successfully deceive his enemy will do so. If in effect it has been said, If I can deceive you, I shall do so, there is no lie, in the sense in which lying is condemned by the Christian religion, in such deception. As to destruction and the horrible forms which it takes, it is none the less true because it is such a commonplace that the more terrible war is the more merciful in reality it becomes. And as for war itself, it has been well said:

'Christianity accepted society and social institutions as it found them; but laid down principles which were intended gradually to alter and abolish what was wrong in them. So slavery was accepted by the Gospel. There is not one word in the New Testament which directly condemns it. But the principle of brotherhood was proclaimed, and this has so wrought in the hearts of men that it has at length brought about the abolition of slavery in Christian communities. In the same way Christianity accepted war. Our Lord and His Apostles never urged soldiers to give up their calling. But it is hard to resist the conclusion that the principles which are laid

down in the Gospel *ought*, if they had honestly been applied on a wide scale, to have led long ago to the disuse of war, at least between Christian nations. What is required is that the principles of Christianity should so leaven society that war should become an impossibility. But until this happy result is brought about, in the face of the absence of any directions in the New Testament to soldiers requiring them to forsake their calling, it can scarcely be maintained that it is *not* "lawful for Christian men to wear weapons and serve in the wars."¹

Mr. Lecky next treats with no less force the subject of 'moral compromise' in the sphere of law. We may quote a passage which shows clearly his general standpoint. After a statement about 'devices' and 'cases' 'which an honourable lawyer will not adopt,' he says:

'Necessary and honourable as the profession may be, there are sides of it which are far from being in accordance with an austere code of ideal morals. It is idle to suppose that a master of the art of advocacy will merely confine himself to a calm dispassionate statement of the facts and arguments of his side. He will inevitably use all his powers of rhetoric and persuasion to make the cause for which he holds a brief appear true, though he knows it to be false; he will affect a warmth which he does not feel and a conviction which he does not hold; he will skilfully avail himself of any mistake or omission of his opponent; of any technical rule that can exclude damaging evidence; of all the resources that legal subtlety and severe cross-examination can furnish to confuse dangerous issues, to obscure or minimise inconvenient facts, to discredit hostile witnesses. He will appeal to every prejudice that can help his cause; he will for the time so completely identify himself with it that he will make its success his supreme and all-absorbing object, and he will hardly fail to feel some thrill of triumph if by the force of ingenious and eloquent pleading he has saved the guilty from his punishment or snatched a verdict in defiance of evidence' (pp. 101-2).

Here, again, we think there is a confusion of thought in Mr. Lecky's reasoning, despite its ability. Since it is understood on every side that it is the work of the advocate to maintain to the uttermost the cause of his client, and since it is a necessity, if justice is in general to be done, that the best possible presentation should be made even of cases that are unjust and of the defence of the guilty, no method of pleading which 'an honourable lawyer' would adopt can be ranked among what are properly called lies. And the existence of trials and lawsuits at all is to some extent parallel to the

¹ Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, pp. 781-2.

existence of war. The Christian religion includes principles which, if completely and universally carried out, would render all trials and lawsuits unnecessary. In the slow working of the influence of true Christian principle they have not yet become so, and there are instances in which Christianity itself demands a trial or suit. In consequence of this and of the practices which 'an honourable lawyer' would adopt not involving sin, the phrase 'moral compromise' is not rightly used.

From 'moral compromise' in law Mr. Lecky goes on to 'moral compromise' in politics. 'In free countries,' he says, 'party government is the best, if not the only, way of conducting public affairs, but it is impossible to conduct it without a large amount of moral compromise; without a frequent surrender of private judgment and will. A good man will choose his party through disinterested motives, and with a firm and honest conviction that it represents the cast of policy most beneficial to the country. He will on grave occasions assert his independence of party, but in the large majority of cases he must act with his party even if they are pursuing courses in some degree contrary to his own judgment' (p. 112).

The seventy-two pages through which Mr. Lecky discusses and illustrates his view of 'moral compromise' in politics are of the greatest interest. With very much which he there says we most cordially agree. But in the passage which we have just quoted and elsewhere there appears to us to be a confusion similar to that which we have already pointed out in connexion with war and law. There is no 'moral compromise' unless something wrong is done. If a member of Parliament is honestly of opinion that it is more in the true interests of the country that the party with which he generally acts should avoid defeat, or should have as large a majority as possible, or should attain as nearly as possible to a majority, than that a particular measure of which he approves or disapproves should be passed or rejected, he is simply doing his duty in supporting his party rather than determining his action by his opinion of the measure in question. If he is doing his duty, there is no 'moral compromise' at all. He is doing what is right.

We do not doubt that political life is full of compromises of many kinds. We do not doubt that many members of Parliament act contrary to their duty. What we maintain is, that the necessary condition of party government is not 'moral compromise.'

In all the departments of war, law, and politics, Mr.

Lecky's admirable work appears to us to be impaired by a confusion of thought which might have been avoided by a clear putting of the issue, What, under given circumstances, is a man's duty? That which is his duty it is right for him to do. In the doing of that which is right there cannot be 'moral compromise.'

We may seem to have laboured this point at too great length. It is, we are convinced, of very great importance for the avoidance of the dangerous condition of a conscience which is beset by scruples.

'The necessities for moral compromise,' Mr. Lecky proceeds,

'may be found in another form not less conspicuously in the Church. The members, and still more the ministers, of an ancient Church bound to formularies and creeds that were drawn up in long bygone centuries, are continually met by the difficulties of reconciling those forms with the changed conditions of human knowledge, and there are periods when the pressure of these difficulties is felt with more than common force' (p. 185).

Instances of the work of 'reconciling,' which, in his judgment, amounts to 'moral compromise,' are to be seen, we are told, in 'the facility with which' 'changes' of belief 'have gradually found their places within the Established Church' (p. 190). 'The Copernican theory' 'that our world is not' 'the centre of the universe' (p. 185), 'the Newtonian discovery that the whole system of the universe was pervaded by one great law' (p. 186), the opinion of the great antiquity of the earth and of man, and that 'for countless ages before the time when Adam was believed to have lost Paradise death had been' the 'most familiar fact and' the 'inexorable law' of 'our globe' (p. 187), 'the Darwinian theory' of 'evolution' (p. 188), the conclusions of 'Comparative Mythology' as to the growth of 'myths and miracles,' and of 'Biblical' and 'historical' 'criticism' as to the analysis of 'the Jewish writings' and 'the phases and variations of religions' (pp. 188-9), all once thought incompatible with the Christian faith, have by degrees, it is said, been accepted by Churchmen and the clergy.

'From the time of Galileo downwards, these changes have been denounced as incompatible with the whole structure of Christian belief. No less an apologist than Bishop Berkeley declared that the belief that the date of the existence of the world was approximately that which could be deduced from the book of Genesis was one of the fundamental beliefs which could not be given up. When the traveller Brydone published his travels in Sicily in

1773, conjecturing, from the deposits of lava, that the world must be much older than the Mosaic cosmogony admitted, his work was denounced as subverting the foundations of the Christian faith. The same charges were brought against the earlier geologists, and in our own day against the early supporters of the Darwinian theory; and many now living can remember the outbursts of indignation against those who first introduced the principles of German criticism into English thought, and who impugned the historical character and the assumed authorship of the Pentateuch' (pp. 189-90).

'Yet few things are more remarkable than the facility with which these successive changes have gradually found their places within the Established Church, and how little that Church has been shaken by this fact' (p. 190).

Now, we demur again to the term 'moral compromise,' so far as we are able to allow that scientific and critical theories have rightly been given place in the Church. If a work of 'reconciling' should be carried on by the surrender or modification of some truth, such a process would properly be styled a 'compromise.' Of it, we are constrained to admit, there have been many instances in writings by members of the English Church in recent years. Against it, we are entitled to point out, this *Review* has maintained a continual protest. Our pages supply a witness that, so far as we are concerned, 'the necessities for moral compromise' 'in the Church' in matters of this kind are not admitted.

We may be asked, Do you then reject 'the Copernican theory' 'that our world is not' 'the centre of the universe'? Certainly, we do not range ourselves with those who maintain that the earth is flat or that the sun moves round it. But we contend that there is no 'compromise' in our accepting 'the Copernican theory' and at the same time continuing to believe in Holy Scripture. A work of 'reconciling' which surrenders or modifies truth or principle is a 'compromise.' A work of investigation and judgment which examines and recognizes the real meaning of truth and the real bearing of principles is not a 'compromise.' The study and thought which have led to the conviction that a right interpretation of the text of the Bible and a true view of the office of Holy Scripture do not necessitate a belief that the sun moves round the earth is a work of the latter kind, not of the former. And so is it also with Mr. Lecky's other instances. Consideration and admission of the real meaning of theological formularies and of the relation of other departments of knowledge to their teaching is not 'compromise' if it is of such a kind as we allow to be desirable or necessary, though it may be rightly called so if it is carried on in that mischievous method of

're
tim

be
Chu

thou
poli
to in
retai
from
part
tion,
pow
of th
serva
part
their
who
no g
men
and
induc
ferme
Henr
formi
theor
simpl
had g
appoi
basis,
Chur
testar
eccles
not re
with
from
cordia
religio
graves
aposta

M
'foun
that t
But i
the
theor
descr

'reconciling' which is a bane of too many thinkers of our time.

'Moral compromise,' again, is considered by Mr. Lecky to be a characteristic feature of the post-Reformation English Church.

'The Church of England was essentially a Protestant Church; though being constructed more than most other Churches under political influences, by successive stages of progress, and with a view to including large and varying sections of opinion in its fold, it retained, more than other Churches, formularies and tenets derived from the Church it superseded. The earnest Protestant and Puritan party which dominated in Scotland and in the Continental Reformation, and which refused all compromise with Rome, had not become powerful in English public opinion till some time after the framework of the Church was established. The spirit of compromise and conservatism which already characterised the English people; the great part which kings and lawyers played in the formation of the Church; their desire to maintain in England a single body, comprising men who had broken away from the Papacy but who had in other respects no great objection to Roman Catholic forms and doctrines, and also men seriously imbued with the strong Protestant feeling of Germany and Switzerland; the strange ductility of belief and conduct that induced the great majority of the English clergy to retain their preferences and avoid persecution during the successive changes of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, all assisted in forming a Church of a very composite character. Two distinct theories found their place within it. According to one school it was simply the pre-Reformation Church purified from certain abuses that had gathered around it, organically united with it through a divinely appointed episcopacy, resting on an authoritative and ecclesiastical basis, and forming one of the three great branches of the Catholic Church. According to the other school it was one of several Protestant Churches, retaining indeed such portions of the old ecclesiastical organisation as might be justified from Scripture, but not regarding them as among the essentials of Christianity; agreeing with other Protestant bodies in what was fundamental, and differing from them mainly on points which were non-essential; accepting cordially the principle that "the Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," and at the same time separated by the gravest and most vital differences from what they deemed the great apostasy of Rome' (pp. 191-2).

Mr. Lecky admits that these 'two distinct theories' have 'found their place within' the Church of England, and admits that there is something to be said in support of each of them. But it must be noticed that his general method of referring to the English Church implies an acceptance of the latter theory that it is 'one of several Protestant Churches.' He describes it in passing as if it were a new body formed in the

sixteenth century. Thus, referring to that century, he speaks of it as 'constructed,' of its 'framework' as being 'established,' of its 'formation,' and of the pre-Reformation English Church having been 'superseded' by it. This, as we think, wholly mistaken view of the Church of England underlies all he says and vitiates much of his argument.

But is it the case that 'moral compromise' must be admitted as having strongly marked the post-Reformation English Church? This question necessitates an answer of a somewhat qualified kind. In some departments of belief there is no shadow of compromise. The historical Creeds have been continuously preserved and used. The central doctrines of the faith received the clearest possible expression in the Articles of Religion. The beliefs which the Universal Church had imposed as terms of communion by Conciliar decisions were unmistakably asserted. Where there were no such Conciliar decisions of the Universal Church a different policy was adopted. The doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is the most important instance. Zwinglianism and Virtualism were definitely rejected. It was clearly affirmed that the faithful communicant receives the Body of Christ, not simply some effect or benefit resulting from it. 'We spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood' are the words of the valuable exhortation which is directed to be used 'at the time of the celebration of the Communion.'¹ 'The Body and Blood of Christ' 'are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper' is the teaching of the Catechism. On the further question whether this presence of the Body and Blood is effected in the Sacrament by the act of consecration, an affirmative answer was suggested. It is unlikely that the words of consecration which had historically been connected with the doctrine of the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the elements would have been retained in the setting in which they stand if the doctrine associated with the use of them was being rejected. The prayer appointed to be used before the Prayer of Consecration by its use of the word 'so' implies that the flesh and blood of Christ are present and received independently of worthy and beneficial reception.

¹ It has long been the practice of the writer of this article to attend the Celebration of the Holy Communion daily whenever he has had opportunity. So far as he can remember, he has only once heard this exhortation read in the last twenty years. This is not the occasion for discussing the subject; but the fact may be mentioned here as one of many illustrations that the system provided by the Book of Common Prayer has never been given a fair chance in the Church of England. Those who have observed some parts of it have neglected others.

190
Th
Ch
ven
to
the
of
Gu
'ex
Sac
the
in v
are
the
pol
hel
suff
hom
and
bot
the
elen
of
trut
mac
belie
imp
Whe
the
a 'm
I
of be
it to
stres
mem
influe

' the
life w
is at l

1 C
2 I
centur
Zwing
the Bi
It sho
kept o

The statement of the twenty-eighth Article that 'the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' which has sometimes been taken to be inconsistent with the doctrine of the real presence in the Sacrament or indeed with an actual reception of the Body of Christ by any communicant, was explained by Bishop Guest, who wrote the phrase in question, as written to 'exclude' 'not' 'the presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and the sensibleness in the receiving thereof.'¹ Yet, while it was thus suggested that in virtue of the act of consecration the bread and the wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, care was taken, alike in the drawing up of formularies and in the carrying out of policy, not to drive out of the Church of England those who held a contrary belief. And it is a remarkable fact, not always sufficiently remembered, that it is possible, with perfect honesty, to quote passages from the leading English Reformers and from the chief seventeenth-century divines in support both of the affirmation and of the denial of the doctrine of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the elements.² Thus, it is hardly to be questioned that the Church of England, while affirming with absolute clearness those truths which Conciliar decisions of the Universal Church had made to be of faith, was content to tolerate differences of belief on matters, of which the Holy Eucharist is the most important instance, about which there were no such decisions. Whether such an attitude, taken up under circumstances of the greatest stress and difficulty, is to be rightly described as a 'moral compromise,' it is not altogether easy to say.

Mr. Lecky is of opinion that the existence of diversities of belief and methods in the English Church has not caused it to be 'enfeebled or disintegrated' (p. 199). He lays great stress on the intellectual ability and activity of many of its members, on their 'political power' (p. 204) and 'educational influence' (p. 205), and on the fact that

'the Church has been very efficacious in promoting that spiritual life which, whatever opinion men may form of its origin and meaning, is at least one of the great realities of human nature' (p. 205).

¹ Guest's Letter to Cecil, December 22, 1566.

² It has recently been well said, 'The Anglican writers of the sixteenth century . . . spoke two languages, sometimes the language of Calvin or Zwingli, and sometimes that of primitive antiquity.' See the Charge of the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles delivered on August 13, 1900, p. 12. It should be added that any toleration of Zwinglianism was carefully kept out of the English formularies.

It is with great satisfaction, though we confess with no little surprise, that we notice that so keen an observer considers the influence of the English Church among the laity to be increasing. Whether it is altogether a matter for congratulation that 'there has' 'of late years been a decided tendency in the best and most cultivated lay opinion of' the 'kind' which has 'come to diverge widely from the Church formularies' 'to look with increasing favour on the Established Church' (p. 210) may well be doubted. It might mean that the 'Established Church' was being viewed as an instrument for the promulgation of a form of Christianity of which the backbone had been destroyed instead of the witness to and the keeper of the faith revealed by God.

This aspect of the Church, indeed, as the divinely appointed guardian of the deposit of the faith is ignored by the accomplished author of this powerful book. It is with evident sympathy that he mentions the view according to which the Church becomes a mere human organization, 'a machine of well-organized beneficence, discharging efficiently and without corruption functions of supreme utility, and constituting one of the main sources of spiritual and moral life in the community' (pp. 210-11). When he says that it is the 'first duty' of the 'ministers' of the 'Established Church' 'to celebrate public worship in such a form that all members of the Church of England may be able to join in it' (p. 209), it is clear that the statement is not made in such a sense as that in which, with the addition of the word 'faithful' before 'members,' we could make it ourselves, and that it is to be read in connexion with the sentence that the Church of England contains 'men whose opinions can hardly be distinguished from simple Deism or Unitarianism' (p. 199). When he says that

'a stranger who enters a church which he has never before seen should be able to feel that he is certain of finding public worship intelligibly and decently performed, as in past generations it has been celebrated in all sections of the Established Church' (p. 209),

however much we may agree in condemning any disregard of the Book of Common Prayer, we cannot but be conscious that this appeal to the practice of 'past generations' 'in all sections of the Established Church' would tend to rob us of much for which the Church of England has definitely made provision, as, for instance, the use of the Eucharistic Vestments ordered in the Ornaments Rubric. When he says

'It
of
cell
nee
boo

whi
rem
than
of v
thos

(p. 1
of a
land

an c

adv

wou

of t

fact

the

that

comp

migh

T

haun

divis

Thor

how

happ

vario

wealt

ness

Some

Mr. I

the c

very

work

every

unsat

witho

high

cepts

in the

to mis

refer

¹ S

Pp. 130

'It is . . . obvious that on some topics a greater degree of reticence of expression should be observed by a clergyman addressing a miscellaneous audience from the pulpit of an Established Church than need be required of him in private life, or even in his published books' (p. 210),

while the statement in itself contains an element of truth, we remember again that this 'audience' whose feelings, rather than the formularies of the Church, are to supply the measure of what the clergyman may say from the pulpit, may include those who hardly fall short of being Deists and Unitarians (p. 199). And, if the word 'Protestant' is used in the sense of anti-Catholic in the prophecy that if the Church of England 'ceases to be a Protestant Church, it will not long remain an established one' (p. 218), we can only say that all the advantages of Establishment to the Church and to the nation would be very dearly purchased by the cost of any betrayal of the historical faith and its subordinate truths. On that fact it is the more necessary to lay emphasis because one of the reasons why Mr. Lecky would regret Disestablishment is that in his opinion 'the latitude of belief and the spirit of compromise that now characterize our English religious life might be seriously impaired' (p. 218).

Throughout our perusal of *The Map of Life* we have been haunted by the recollection of the opening articles of the first division of the second part of the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas. Students of that great work will remember how St. Thomas, in finding the 'beatitudo' or true and highest happiness of the soul to be in the vision of God, sweeps away various supposed ideas of 'beatitudo,' as that it consists in wealth or honour or power, and maintains that the true happiness needs nothing but God and the means of approach to Him. Something of this enthusiastic spirit is, it seems to us, what Mr. Lecky's book sadly needs. The ability, the knowledge, the calm and deliberate judgment displayed in it, are of the very highest order. From a literary point of view, it is the work of a master-mind and a master-hand. It is animated everywhere by a strongly moral tone. But, as a whole, it is unsatisfying because it discusses the pursuit of happiness without taking into account the highest motives and the highest aims. A painful paragraph on the 'Evangelical precepts' contained in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere in the teaching of our Lord (pp. 214-15) may perhaps be due to misunderstanding of the meaning and scope of the words referred to.¹ Yet there can be no adequate consideration of

¹ See Liddon, *Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, pp. 130-2; Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*.

the nature of happiness and the means of attaining it which does not give due place to that temper of mind and way of conduct of which Mr. Lecky's attempt 'to steer clear of questions of contested theologies' (p. 321) has forbidden him to speak.

ART. VII.—THE NEW DICTIONARY OF THE
BIBLE, VOL. III.

1. *A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents, including the Biblical Theology.* Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, M.A., and, chiefly in the Revision of the Proofs, of Professors DAVIDSON, DRIVER, and SWETE. Vol. III. (Kir—Pleiades). (Edinburgh and New York, 1900.)

WE retain the title placed above our two articles on the preceding volumes of Dr. Hastings's Dictionary,¹ although in the meantime Dr. Cheyne has begun to publish his more advanced and much more unsatisfactory *Encyclopædia Biblica*.² The fact that we have devoted an article to the consideration of the Dictionary, volume by volume, will indicate to our readers our sense of the importance of the work. In fact, it would be impossible in a Short Notice to do full justice to the large quantity of materials in each part, and to deal not only with the excellent contributions of many writers, but also, as we must add, with the grave defects, and worse, which mark a considerable number of the articles on 'introductions' to books of Holy Scripture and on Biblical Theology. We were of opinion that as a whole the second volume did not quite reach the level of the importance of the first, and we now consider that the third volume occupies a place of merit between the earlier two, more nearly equal perhaps to the first than to the second. Like them this volume is strong and excellent in geographical and archæological subjects, and comparatively weaker and not uncommonly unsatisfactory in its readiness to adopt modern popular views of criticism without sufficient proof, and in its failure to appreciate the full value of the bearing of the evidence of Holy Scripture upon momentous questions of theology and ecclesiastical institu-

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, Nos. 92 and 96.

² *Ibid.* No. 99.

tions. From the abundant illustrations of these remarks which might be quoted it will only be necessary, and it is indeed only possible, to select some typical examples. But they will be enough to set before our readers the general character of the work, and the mixed value of its contents. It will be seen that the present volume contains several articles of the first order of importance, and that, as is probably unavoidable, there are some articles which cover portions of earlier contributions. The number of names in the list of authors has again slightly declined. In the first volume there were, excluding the editor, who continues as before to contribute some articles, 135 authors, in the second 119, and in this 114. It is necessary to warn our readers that they must not suppose that the doctrinal quality of all the work is to be inferred from the presence of a few, or indeed of many, theological writers of the Church of England in this list. Indeed while the presence of some names is a guarantee for sound doctrine, there are others of various sects which have been included for very different reasons, on the ground of their fine scholarship, or their success in exploration, or some kind of literary distinction which is not necessarily connected with the full faith of Christendom. Among the contributors to this volume are Mr. Bebb, Professor Gwatkin, Mr. A. C. Headlam, the Warden of Keble, Dr. Alfred Plummer of Durham, Dr. Robertson of King's College, London, Professor Stanton, Professor Swete, and Mr. Turner; and there are large regions of knowledge of various kinds represented by Professors Driver, Margoliouth, Sayce, and Kennedy, Professor Petrie, Mr. Pinches, Major-Generals Sir C. Warren and Sir C. W. Wilson; and again there are such contributors as Professors Denney, Ramsay, and Salmond. Under each of the four heads of Biblical Theology, Antiquities and Biography, Geography and Archæology, and Prolegomena or Introductory Matter, there are on a rough computation about twenty important articles. By this result the third volume is shown to stand in a not unfavourable relation towards its two predecessors. We may institute another comparison for the purpose of general illustration by saying that this volume, from Kir to Pleiades, occupies 896 pages; whereas thirty-seven years ago Dr. William Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, with a smaller page though with smaller type, covered the same section of the alphabet with 853 pages. This comparison will, however, be deceptive unless we remember that Dr. Smith expressly explained that his work, which represented the best scholarship of the day on antiquities, biography, geography, and

natural history, was a dictionary of the Bible and not of theology. It is of some importance also to observe that Dr. Smith included in this part of his Dictionary a long article on the Pentateuch. But under this word Dr. Hastings only refers to Hexateuch in the second volume, in which, as our readers may recollect, the Rev. F. H. Woods makes the central statement of the theories of critical processes which so many other writers in the Dictionary quote as rendering proof on their part superfluous. We have already said plainly why we consider Mr. Woods's article to be unequal to the great strain of demonstration which is thus put upon it.¹

The articles of an introductory nature upon special books include Lamentations, Leviticus, the Gospel according to St. Luke, Malachi, the Gospel according to St. Mark, the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Micah, Nahum, Numbers, Obadiah, the two Epistles of St. Peter, Philemon, and Philippians. To these may be added the articles on the books of the Maccabees, and the prayer of Manasses, as well as important contributions on the Language of the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha, the Latin Versions, the New Testament and its Canon, and the Old Testament and its Canon. In his article on Lamentations Mr. Selbie argues against Ewald, and mainly follows Löhr in his provisional scheme of analysis, and he sets out the reasons which have been given against Jeremiah's authorship and the unity of the book. But he notices that Professor Robertson Smith argued strongly that the book is a unity, and leaves the subject with the remark—which must be applied to many of the matters upon which higher critics have made confident assertions—that on this question criticism has not yet spoken the last word. To his list of literature we should like to add a reference to a passage which in our judgment contains sounder and more fruitful exegesis of the Lamentations of Jeremiah than several of the works which he names.² The books of Leviticus and Numbers are discussed by Mr. Harford-Battersby on the same principles of analysis as are used in the articles on Genesis and Exodus, and set forth in the article on Hexateuch, to which Mr. Harford-Battersby conveniently refers for 'proofs.' If we could take so much as he takes for granted we should be able to devote ourselves to the expression of our commendation of his industry in both these full articles. For example, under Leviticus he gives an analytical summary and critical notes on each of the four

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 96, pp. 306-7.

² Liddon, *Sermons on some Words of Christ*, p. 238.

success
of Sa
Clean
and th
other
is, as
Mr. H
names
up th
them
produ
the B
oldest
is the
a list
though
was th
more
is inde
Anoth
canoni
religio
appare
well ha
the sam
history
the res
Tabern
the mi
even th
work, f
vising,
reache
on the
Histori
doctrin
priesth
years o
mation,
whole a
Religio
priestly
Holy G
someth
sure the

successive divisions of the book, which he marks as the Law of Sacrifice, the Consecration of the Priesthood, the Law of Clean and Unclean (with appendix on the Day of Atonement), and the Law of Holiness (also with an appendix, on vows and other matters). The determination of authorship and date is, as our readers may suppose, a complex problem in Mr. Harford-Battersby's hands. Though he cannot arrive at names of authors he feels able approximately to 'reckon up the number of distinct writers whose hands betray themselves in the striking example of well-designed literary product, which we call the book of Leviticus.' Taking first the Book of Holiness as one 'which, all will admit, is the oldest,' Mr. Harford-Battersby infers that its substantial unity is the unity of a school and not of an individual. He gives a list of passages which resemble the prophecies of Ezekiel, though he does not commit himself to the theory that Ezekiel was the author of the code. In fact, he has nothing much more definite to say of these laws than that 'their antiquity is indeed better established than any theory of their origin.' Another part of Leviticus is ascribed to a school of priestly canonists 'who set themselves to reduce to writing the current religious praxis of the Jerusalem Temple, all of which was apparently accepted as Mosaic.' Their labours may very well have been developed, we are told, yet further by one of the same school and embodied in the great priestly book of history and law. The most natural date is given as 'after the restoration,' because no trace of the priestly system of the Tabernacle with Aaron as the priest and the sons of Levi as the ministering tribe is found till the arrival of Ezra. Not even then, however, have we reached the present form of the work, for 'lastly came a long line of scribes, combining, revising, expanding, and supplementing, until the Pentateuch reached its present form.' The article concludes with remarks on the historical significance and religious value of the book. Historically it is regarded as 'a great witness to the Christian doctrine of evolution,' as the literary monument of the Hebrew priesthood, as in part preserving the customs of the earlier years of the monarchy, and of the period after Josiah's reformation, and some reflection of previous centuries, but as a whole as the mirror of the second Temple and its system. Religiously, the book teaches us that we still need 'the priestly view of religion,' that we must aim at the ideal of the Holy God amid a holy people in a holy land, that we need something visible and outward in our worship, though to be sure the great Sacrament of the Christian religion 'replaces

sacrifice proper by commemoration and communion,' that the lay priests and the 'commissioned representatives' of God must remember their solemn duties, and that 'the body matters intensely.' Anyone who will turn to our article on Dr. Baxter's *Sanctuary and Sacrifice*, a most valuable book which is an unanswered—we need not say unanswerable—reply to Wellhausen, will see our reasons duly set forth why we are unable to accept the view of the date of Leviticus on which the inferences of this article are based.¹ In the literature of the subject Mr. Harford-Battersby does not even mention Dr. Baxter's work. His list is, in fact, one-sided, and published answers to his main theories are ignored. Yet, on the grounds of higher criticism, all evidence and all arguments should be taken into account. What may be called the parallel article on the book of Numbers is similar in outline, and the three chief sections of the book on the camp at Sinai, the wanderings, and the scenes in the plains of Moab, are taken as containing materials which are 'often very loosely strung on the main thread of narrative,' while 'several chapters are a mosaic (no reference to Moses is intended) made up out of fragments from different sources.' As for authorship and date 'all the strata of literary deposit in the Hexateuch seem to be laid bare' in a section taken through the book. Historically it is on the whole 'impossible to accept its testimony as in the modern sense historical,' and religiously, in addition to what is common between Leviticus and Numbers, a few distinctive lessons are added on national and personal life, on Divine guidance and inspiration, and on the worship and administration of the Church. The four remaining Old Testament books in this third volume, it will be observed, are all among the Minor Prophets. The book of Nehemiah is not considered in this volume, having already been treated under the heading of Ezra-Nehemiah. Malachi is undertaken by Mr. Welch, Micah by Professor Nowack of Strassburg, Nahum by Professor Kennedy, and Obadiah by Mr. Selbie. All these writers, except Mr. Welch, include Dr. Pusey's great commentary in their lists of literature, but none of them refer to Bishop Wordsworth, whose 'introductions' to the books of the Bible have the special merit of setting forth the underlying spiritual unity of all Scripture. It is noticeable that the articles on the three synoptic Gospels all fall within this volume. Mr. Bebb contributes a valuable article of about twenty-three columns on St. Luke's Gospel,

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 85, p. 186. See especially p. 198.

and
date
sour
and
the C
aime
topic
tratic
Mr. I
Luke
Luke
of St
a cor
and a
nor o
Mr. I
rogat
only
cusse
colum
deepe
last t
canno
pre-c
comm
primi
Matth
is, w
Synop
two E
article
tribut
of the
'the a
sumpt
reconc
sition
this co
which
portan
a supp
J. H. I
useful
of slav
to the

and discusses the questions of authorship and canonicity, the date and place of writing, the transmission of the text, the sources used, the relation of St. Luke to St. Paul, Josephus and Marcion, the style, preface, purpose, and arrangement of the Gospel and its general characteristics. Mr. Bebb has thus aimed at dealing with the main headings of the general topics connected with the Gospel, and giving sufficient illustrations to explain the allusions. Perhaps the best part of Mr. Bebb's carefully written article is the discussion of St. Luke's relation to the other Gospels. He concludes that St. Luke follows, over a large part of the narrative, the Gospel of St. Mark as we now have it, that he had with St. Matthew a common written source, that he had access to oral tradition and also to some special written sources, neither Ebionitic nor otherwise one-sided. We must add that we regret that Mr. Bebb places the Ascension, though with a note of interrogation, among the sections of the narrative which are found only in St. Luke. The Gospel according to St. Mark is discussed by Professor Salmond in an article of twenty-eight columns, which touches, of course, upon many topics of the deepest interest. The writer is not inclined to accept the last twelve verses as a part of the original Gospel. But he cannot accept the hypothesis of an 'Ur-markus,' a primitive pre-canonical writing, though he mentions favourably the common conclusion that St. Mark's Gospel is the most primitive of the Synoptist narratives. The article on St. Matthew's Gospel, by Professor Bartlet of Mansfield College, is, we consider, of less value than Professor Salmond's Synoptic contribution, and still less than Mr. Bebb's. The two Epistles of St. Peter are the subjects of two very long articles by Dr. F. H. Chase. In the second of these two contributions Dr. Chase enters upon a very elaborate examination of the genuineness of the second Epistle, and concludes that 'the absolute insufficiency of external evidence creates a presumption against its genuineness,' and that 'it is hard to reconcile the literary character of the Epistle with the supposition that St. Peter wrote it.' While we must dissent from this conclusion we desire to acknowledge the fulness with which the evidence is laid before us. In a matter not unimportant, but of less gravity than the foregoing, Dr. Chase is a supporter of the priority of the Epistle of St. Jude. Dr. J. H. Bernard's article on the Epistle to Philemon contains a useful section on the apostolic attitude towards the institution of slavery. The reader of Dr. Gibb's article on the Epistle to the Philippians would not obtain a very clear conception

of St. Paul's Christology from the remark on ii. 5-11 that 'this passage has been pressed into the service of speculative theology, and many attempts have been made to extract from it an apostolic doctrine of the relations of the Divine and human natures of our Lord.' A true estimate of the historical value of the books of the Maccabees will be formed from the perusal of Mr. W. Fairweather's article, and Professor Porter of Yale gives a satisfactory account of the 'fine penitential prayer' of Manasses. The two articles on the Language of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha are learned contributions by Professor Margoliouth, and the remark with which he concludes his second article seems to us to contain wise caution which might well restrain some of the wilder suppositions of extravagant critics. He says, 'Too little of the original language can in any case be recovered to enable us to speak with certainty of its character.' That observation, in our opinion, strikes at the very foundation of no small part of the whole structure of modern critical theories, and when we remember the immense erudition of the writer, we attach great importance to it. The article on the Language of the New Testament is contributed by Professor Thayer of Harvard, and forms an excellent introduction to the study of the Greek Testament. Under the heading of the Old Latin Versions Dr. Kennedy of Callander gives a very full history of the early Latin translations of the Bible. Their later developments from the time of St. Jerome onwards are to be treated under the head of the Vulgate. The general article on the New Testament is written by Dr. M'Clymont of Aberdeen, and the New Testament Canon is discussed by Professor Stanton. Dr. M'Clymont comments upon the relation of the New Testament to the Old Testament, to the Apocrypha, to patristic and apocryphal Christian writings, and gives an account of its history and some cursory observations upon its separate books. Professor Stanton surveys his subject in chronological sections, and supplies the reader with concisely arranged materials for the study of the Canon. The parallel articles on the Old Testament and the Old Testament Canon are written by Professor Curtis of Yale and the Rev. F. H. Woods respectively. Professor Curtis proceeds, of course, upon the general view of the Old Testament which is adopted by the writers of this Dictionary, and describes in accordance with it the origin and growth of the groups of books as sacred literature, giving an account of their use and method of interpretation when united into the Old Testament. Mr. Woods very carefully examines the evidence of the con-

tent
the
and
spec
the
Lore
4
Biog
mate
the
Mag
Moo
Neh
Patri
Phill
Egyp
very
artic
writ
necte
biogr
about
exam
Bart
Matt
of w
autho
Macc
subje
Magi
Bene
that v
mend
Aber
contri
discu
betrot
the vi
writ
neithe
which
can on
of En
two p
as rel

tents of the Jewish Canon and compares it with the forms of the Christian Canon, first tracing the evidence backwards, and then reconstructing a connected history. We may specially refer, and refer with satisfaction, to the section on the way in which the Old Testament was regarded by our Lord and His disciples.

A list of some of the chief articles on Antiquities and Biography will show what a large amount of important material they include. Among these articles are those under the heads of Lazarus of Bethany, St. Luke, Maccabees, Magic, Mark, Marriage, Mary, St. Matthew, Medes, Mene, Moon, Moses, Mourning, Music, Natural History, Nazirite, Nehemiah, Nero, Nicodemus, Noah, Number, Passover, Patriarchs, Paul, Pentecost, Peter, Pharaoh, Pharisees, Philistines, Philosophy, Phylacteries, Pilate, and Plagues of Egypt. Dr. Plummer's article on Lazarus of Bethany is a very excellent piece of apologetic work. The biographical articles on St. Luke, the Maccabees, and St. Matthew are written by the same authors as the articles on the books connected with those names, but Dr. F. H. Chase undertakes the biography of St. Mark. Mr. Bebb sifts the assertions made about St. Luke outside the New Testament, and Dr. Chase examines at greater length the traditions of St. Mark. Mr. Bartlet briefly narrates such additional details about St. Matthew as he has not included in his article on the Gospel of which he only regards St. Matthew as 'indirectly the author.' Mr. Fairweather's survey of the history of the Maccabees leaves little to be desired. The far-reaching subjects which are indicated by the mention of the Magi and Magic are discussed in interesting contributions from Mr. Benecke and Professor Whitehouse of Cheshunt. We regret that we are not able to speak in terms of unreserved commendation of the careful article which Professor Paterson of Aberdeen has written on Marriage. It is a comprehensive contribution, in which the form and duties of marriage are discussed, its conditions and bars, the law of the levirate, betrothal, nuptial rites and customs, adultery, divorce, and the view of marriage as a symbol of spiritual truths. The writer regards marriage with a deceased wife's sister as neither directly forbidden nor condemned by the principles which underlie the prohibitions of the Levitical code. We can only here point out that the teaching which the Church of England bases upon her interpretation of the Bible involves two principles—that relationship by marriage is as important as relationship by blood, and that marriage within three

degrees of any kind of relationship is not lawful. Professor Paterson's answer to the question whether our Lord allowed even adultery to be a valid ground of divorce is that the negative answer, 'it must be admitted, is not without foundation, while yet regard for the accepted canons of New Testament criticism precludes the claim that it has been established.' On the further question whether divorce may be sought on other grounds than adultery, the writer says that if our Lord allowed divorce at all, 'which is the most doubtful point in the argument, it is quite legitimate to extend the exception to cases involving a real moral subversion of marriage.' On re-marriage the writer does not speak decisively. The meaning of 'whosoever marrieth her that is put away committeth adultery' is discussed in a note which says that the view that only the re-marriage of the unlawfully divorced woman is prohibited is the 'natural' one, but that this involves the curious—or as we should say monstrous—consequence that an innocent woman is, but a guilty woman is not, prohibited from a second marriage. The writer infers from St. Matthew xix. 9 that the husband of a guilty wife may marry again, and from this inference deduces the further result that a woman who has divorced her husband on the ground of his immorality should be free to take another husband. But, on the other hand, he points out that a legal dissolution of marriage does not necessarily justify re-marriage, and that the legal decision raises the further question whether the marriage was broken in the sense intended by our Lord. In regard to what has been called the filthy miasma of the divorce courts, the writer does not think that the occasions of legal dissolution allowed by law in Great Britain amount to less than moral subversion of marriage. The concluding section of the article does not make sufficiently clear the sacramental nature of Christian marriage nor the significance of the allusion to our Lord's essential unity with Jehovah, involved in His title of the Bridegroom. Two necessarily long articles under the head of Mary are written by Professor Mayor. One of these, about fifteen columns in length, is devoted to the subject of our Lord's blessed Mother, and in about the same space the other Maries are considered. A full discussion is inserted upon the difficult question of the anointings, and the identity of the sister of Martha, the penitent who anointed the Lord's feet, and St. Mary Magdalene. To Professor Mayor it appears that the easiest way of escape from the difficulties of the narratives of the anointings is to suppose that the original form of St. Luke's narrative contained no reference to

an
o
de
gro
wo
an
on
the
the
and
alte
the
mir
it,
Gos
is r
have
hard
tion
large
tions
birth
silen
from
impo
it.
sider
discu
Profe
word
tural
there
given
the a
use th
The a
the wa
the D
goliou
consid
and M
and H
long a
Highe
the 'A

VOL.

anointing at all. He adds a sketch of the history of opinion on the whole question. The section of the article which is devoted to St. Mary Magdalene shows how slight is the ground for supposing that she was the same person as 'the woman that was a sinner' in St. Luke's narrative, and adds an account of her subsequent legendary history. The article on our Lord's Mother is divided into four parts, the facts in the New Testament, the Apocryphal Gospels and elsewhere, the history of opinion respecting her, her place in Liturgiology, and lastly in Art. We are not satisfied with either of the two alternatives which Professor Mayor offers as accounting for the silence of St. Mark upon the subject of our Lord's miraculous birth—either that he was unacquainted with it, or did not regard it as an essential part of the Gospel message. And when he says that no allusion is made to it in the Acts or the Epistles, we should have been glad to see an allusion, in addition to a hardly satisfactory reference to Gal. iv. 4, to one interpretation of 1 St. Tim. ii. 15, not to say to the existence of a large number of passages which present hopeless contradictions and impossibilities unless the truth of the miraculous birth underlies them. The writer might also have added that silence upon the subject is exactly what might be expected from those who believed in it, and who realized its tremendous import, and used language which is only to be explained by it. The meaning of the 'brethren of the Lord' was considered in an earlier article, so that it was not necessary to discuss here the question of the perpetual virginity. But Professor Mayor might well have said more definitely that the words of Elizabeth in St. Luke i. 43 are at least one Scriptural warrant for the title of Theotocos. We must add that there should be a more explanatory rendering of this word given than 'Mother of God,' and a more precise account of the august conciliar and patristic authority which justifies its use than would be supposed from the Professor's scanty note. The article on the Medes, by Professor Sayce, is an example of the way in which the results of modern discoveries are used in the Dictionary to illustrate the sacred history; Professor Margoliouth applies his vast stores of linguistic scholarship to the consideration of the words 'Mene Mene Tekel Upharsin,' and Mr. Pinches writes, out of the fulness of his Assyrian and Egyptian knowledge, upon the Moon. Mr. Bennet's long article on Moses affords scope for the display of the Higher Critical method of the Dictionary, and an article on the 'Assumption of Moses' as a Jewish writing of the first

century is added by Mr. Burkitt. Professor Nicol of Aberdeen contributes a good article on Mourning, and Mr. Millar of New Cumnock is the author of a very full and well-illustrated article on Music. The Natural History of the Bible was entrusted with satisfactory results to Professor Post of Beyrout. Dr. Eaton of Glasgow gives an account of the law of the Nazirite in seven columns. The biography of Nehemiah is written by Professor Batten of Philadelphia, and the life of Nero is described in such terms as it deserves by Professor Cowan of Aberdeen. Dr. J. H. Bernard, in an article on Nicodemus, takes the conversation in St. John iii. to be 'historical, although probably rehandled and condensed by the evangelist,' and Professor von Dobschütz contributes an account of the document which is variously known as the Gospel of Nicodemus or the Acts of Pilate, discussing its name, contents, versions, and manuscripts, date, sources, purpose, composition, and influence. The history of Noah is considered in full in the second volume of the Dictionary, and here we only have a few additional words by Mr. Woods, and an account of 'the book of Noah' by Professor Charles. Under the head of Number Professor König of Bonn makes a peculiarly interesting contribution upon the relation of numbers to textual criticism, rhetoric, and theology. The use of figures, of round numbers, of holy and symbolic numbers, and the art of Gemetria—most commonly known by its application to the number of the beast—cover a large part of the field of Holy Scripture. A long article on the Passover by Mr. Moulton of Yale examines the Old Testament references on the basis of the critical conclusions of the Dictionary, investigates the origin and primitive significance of the rite, and its celebration after the exile. The important place of the Passover in the Chronology of our Lord's life was considered earlier in the excellent article by Mr. Turner. Dr. John Taylor discusses the longevity of the patriarchs, and describes what is a difficult problem, without, we think, saying much by way of solving it. The article on the Hebrew term Pharaoh is written by Mr. Griffith of the British Museum; a longer contribution of seventeen columns is Dr. Eaton's account of the origin, history, and characteristics of the Pharisees, with a section on their relation to our Lord. The place which the Philistines occupy in the Bible is adequately set forth in an article by Professor Beecher of Auburn, New York. Professor Kilpatrick of Winnipeg writes eleven columns upon Philosophy and the contact of Christianity with it, introduced by some prefatory observations of a more

general character. We commend the admirable concluding section of this article to those who suppose that there is anything in the Nicene Creed which 'in respect of the truth sought to be expressed, is not already in the New Testament.' Professor Kennedy gives an exhaustive account of Phylacteries. The character and history of the unhappy Pilate is written in seven columns by Dr. Purves of Princeton, who takes 'What is truth?' as 'the utterance of a worldly mind, entirely sceptical of the worth of real religious and moral principles.' Professor Macalister chiefly treats the Plagues of Egypt in relation to the surrounding conditions of Egyptian life, and frankly describes what is 'plainly miraculous' as such, without entering into an apologetic discussion. We must mention lastly two articles which are the chief contributions to the biographical part of this volume of the Dictionary. Professor Findlay writes a very elaborate article of about sixty-nine columns on the life and doctrine of St. Paul, and Dr. F. H. Chase in about forty-five columns writes a history of St. Peter, with an estimate of his place in Christian tradition, and an attempt to reconstruct the history of his connexion with Rome. Professor Findlay, in the biographical portion of his article, includes a discussion of the various views which have been taken of St. Paul's thorn, an excellent section on the conversion of the great Apostle, and as full an account as the space permits of his missionary career, with an examination of the meaning of the term Galatia, and a brief historical survey of his Epistles. The second part of the article on the Apostle's doctrine belongs to Biblical Theology. An excellent map of St. Paul's travels accompanies the article, which may well be studied as a concise general introduction to the study of St. Paul's Epistles. Professor Purves writes an article of six columns on Pentecost, which is satisfactory in the Old Testament part, but hardly brings out the significance of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on that day in Acts ii. It would be difficult to add anything of importance to Dr. Chase's comprehensive article on St. Peter.

Among the Geographical, Archæological, and Miscellaneous articles are Laodicea, Lebanon, Lycaonia, Medicine, Melita, Memphis, Michmash, Mines, Moab, Money, Nazareth, Nineveh, Olives (Mount of), Palestine, Perga, Pergamus, Philadelphia, Philippi, Phœnicia, Phœnix, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Plain.

So far as the New Testament articles of this section are concerned the greatest portion of the work has fallen into the

very capable hands of Professor Ramsay. He has written upon Laodicea, Lycaonia, Perga, Pergamus, Philadelphia, Phœnix, Phrygia, and Pisidia, and there are also other geographical articles of no small merit from his pen which might be mentioned. Dr. F. J. Bliss contributes an article on Lebanon, and Professor Macalister has fully treated the subject of Medicine in a communication of twenty-five columns. Melita, which we expected to see discussed by Professor Ramsay, has been satisfactorily undertaken by Dr. Robertson. Professor Max Müller of Philadelphia has written on Memphis, and Sir C. Warren on Michmash. Professor Hull of Dublin discusses Mines and Mining, and Professor Bennet gives a full account of the Moabite Stone with an accompanying illustration under the head of Moab. Professor Kennedy has undertaken the important article on Money, and the editor has inserted two excellent plates of the coins current in Palestine from B.C. 500 to A.D. 135. The brief article on Nazareth by Mr. Thatcher may be mentioned rather by reason of the sacred interest of the place than for any special points for comment in the article itself. Professor Sayce writes on Nineveh, and Sir C. Warren on the Mount of Olives. A longer article, and the most important in the geographical section of this volume, is the account of the geology, natural features, climate, natural products, races, geography, and antiquities of Palestine by Colonel Conder. Mr. Turner's good article on Philippi has an exegetical as well as a geographical value for the student of St. Paul's writings. Mr. Thatcher writes a general article on Phœnicia, and Professor Driver distinguishes the various uses of the word Plain as a substantive.

We have finally to notice the important articles which fall under the head of Biblical Theology. They include Knowledge, Law, Laying on of hands, Life and Death, Logos, Lord of Hosts, Lord's Day, Lord's Prayer, Lord's Supper, Love, Love Feasts, Man, Man of Sin, Maranatha, Mediator, Messiah, Millennium, Minister, Miracle, Mystery, Name, Names, Nature, Offer, Ordination, Parable, Paraclete, Paradise, Parousia, and St. Paul (part ii.) Professor Driver traces the use of the word Knowledge in the Bible, not generally, but in its ethico-religious sense, or so far as there is an approximation to a technical (theological) use of it. The same writer contributes the Old Testament section of the article on Law, examining the history of the term Torah, its judicial ceremonial and moral parts, the rise and history of written Torah, the synonyms of 'law,' and the different codes of

He
crit
by
in t
pra
esp
Hel
refe
Swe
at a
doc
Scri
first
disc
Dri
Hos
limi
the
orig
wors
the I
there
as a
notic
adje
Plum
ence
write
Lord
types
sacri
heads
rite;
which
some
Euch
burgh
with s
But w
of Ch
The V
does
words
editor

Hebrew law as they are commonly classified by the higher critics. The New Testament section of the subject is written by Professor Denney, who considers the use of the term 'law' in the New Testament; our Lord's relation to the law; the practice and teaching of the earliest Christian society, and especially of St. Paul; the evidence of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the other New Testament books, with special reference of course to the Epistle of St. James. Professor Swete's satisfactory article on the Laying on of hands errs, if at all, on the side of brevity. Mr. G. C. Martin draws out doctrinal and ethical conclusions from an examination of the Scriptural use of the terms Life and Death. Professor Purves first accurately states St. John's doctrine of the Logos, and then discusses the reason for the use of that term. Professor Driver writes the short but important article on Lord of Hosts. Mr. White of Dublin, in an article of necessarily limited scope upon the Lord's Day, discusses the term itself, the connexion of the Lord's Day with the Sabbath, the origin of the institution, and the nature of Lord's Day worship in New Testament times. Dr. Plummer's article on the Lord's Prayer is an admirable contribution on the exact text thereof, the sources of the Prayer, and its contents regarded as a form, a summary, and a pattern. In particular, special notice is taken of the words 'Our Father,' 'daily' (the only adjective in the Prayer), and 'deliver us from evil.' To Dr. Plummer's excellent list of literature we should add a reference to the striking exposition of Ludolphus.¹ The same writer is the author of an equally satisfactory article on the Lord's Supper, devoted to a discussion of its terminology, its types, the partial anticipations of it in the Passover and other sacrificial feasts, the history of the Christian rite under the heads of the institution, the recipients, the minister, and the rite; and, finally, a brief discussion of Scriptural passages which bear upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and some notice of the tests by which later developments of Eucharistic doctrine may be judged. Professor Orr of Edinburgh writes well on Love in the Old and New Testaments, with some allusions to other attributes of the Divine character. But we much regret that Dr. Uhlhorn's work on the history of Christian Charity is not mentioned in the list of literature. The Warden of Keble, in his concise article on Love-Feasts, does not omit the book. 'Man' is one of the two great words which are the subject of the Bible. The general editor treats of the grammatical usage of the word itself, and

¹ *Vita Christi*, part i. chap. xxxvii., 'De Oratione Dominica.'

Professor Adeney pursues the subject further, and adds sections also on man's origin and nature, the unity of his race, and his destiny. The article strikes us as being exceedingly thin and altogether inadequate to the momentous place which it should occupy. There should have been some allusion to the Fall and its effects; to the contrast between man's original state; to the 'recapitulation' and recovery of man in Christ; to the magnificent sweep of human history which is made in such parables as the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son. As it is, the article is a sad instance of a wasted opportunity, and no list of literature is added, though such books as Bishop Ullathorne's *The Endowments of Man*, might most fitly have been mentioned. Dr. James, of the Fitz-William Museum, makes a brief contribution to Apocalyptic literature by his article on the Man of Sin and Antichrist. Professor Thayer of Harvard touches upon eschatological subjects in the article on Maranatha, and discusses the connexion in thought between that term and the word anathema, as used in a line with it by St. Paul. In the article on Mediator, Mediation, Professor Adeney makes a much longer effort to rise to a great opportunity. Readers of the works of St. Athanasius and Hooker and Archdeacon Wilberforce, which are not included in Professor Adeney's list of literature, will know what scope this article affords for a masterly survey of the great principle of the Incarnation, viewed in its harmony with God's work in nature, in the great mysteries of Christological dogma, and in the Sacramental agencies of our Lord's mystical body. It is fortunate that we know where to go for such things. In Professor Adeney's article will be found some introductory discussion of the meaning and use of the term Mediator, and of the idea of Mediation in religion, and then an examination of Mediation in Paganism and in the Old and New Testaments. We are not unreasonable in saying that we expected at least some detailed treatment of the ways in which God's blessings are bestowed upon us through parental mediation; and if Professor Adeney desired to emphasize the value of attention to the study of comparative religion he might at all events have included in his list of literature a reference to Dr. Jevons's *Introduction to the History of Religion*.¹ Professor Stanton contributes an article on Messiah, distinguishing between the historical and theological points of view. He traces the outline of the history of Jewish Messianic belief, and comments specially on the Messiah as Prophet, as a Sufferer, and as the Son of

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 87.

Ma
unc
tion
tho
par
tha
Pro
Yon
Mil
stor
hist
Aug
Col
and
any
the
as a
rem
or
seve
is a
The
bilit
tion
Apo
mira
this
confi
to th
from
the e
head
to co
the s
of Jo
ing t
time
forecl
Andr
Testa
myste
The b
glad t
and t
full N

Man. The New Testament part of the subject is considered under the unsatisfactory title of 'The Christian Transformation'; and we are afraid that we must be numbered among those for whom Professor Stanton has written the concluding paragraph of his article, by way of giving some assurance that modern inquiry still allows us to see signs of Divine Providence in ancient prophecies. Professor Brown of New York discharges a task of wide range in his article on the Millennium with fair success, and, without embarking on the stormy sea of later Millenarianism, brings his survey of the history down to the permanent defeat of Chiliasm by St. Augustine's *City of God*. Professor Massie, of Mansfield College, gives an account of the word Minister in the Old and New Testaments, and though he cannot be said to make any valuable contribution to the history of the third order of the ministry of the Church, we may use one of his sentences as a broad plate for the altar, so to speak, by noticing his remark that 'Whether the seven were technically deacons or not, they must surely have suggested the office in the several churches later on.' Dr. Bernard's article on Miracle is a solid contribution of thirty-three columns to the subject. The objective possibility of miracles, their subjective credibility, their evidential value, the characteristics and attestation of the Gospel miracles, the miracles in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Old Testament, and the Christian miracles after the Apostolic age are the heads under which this important subject is very carefully discussed. We can confidently commend the New Testament part of this article to those who suppose that the supernatural can be extruded from the Gospels; but we are quite unable to recognize that the evidence for such miracles as the swimming of the axe-head or the speaking of Balaam's ass is not 'at all sufficient to compel implicit credence in their literal truth.' And in the still graver matter of our Lord's application of the history of Jonah we are not content to set aside the matter by saying that the most careful and devout scholars of our own time do not consider that all inquiry into its literal truth is foreclosed by our Lord's words. Professor Stewart of St. Andrew's, in an article on Mystery, considers the New Testament use of the word, the chief features of the Greek mysteries, and their influence upon New Testament language. The best part of the article is the second section, and we are glad to see that Dr. Jevons's book is mentioned, but the first and third sections of the article do not nearly bring out the full New Testament teaching on the subject so well as it is

set forth in the Church Catechism. Two articles on Name and Proper Names by Professor Gray of Mansfield College contain a discussion of the significance of the term and the ideas expressed by it, the various customs connected with the giving of names, names of places and of persons, both simple and compound. The Name which is above every name occupies a very obscure place in these two articles, not being mentioned in the second article at all. This is a disgraceful blot on the Dictionary. The most sacred Name of Jesus is the central name of the Bible, and there should have been here a clear and definite statement that the Personal Godhead of the Redeemer and His Work of Salvation are both comprised in His all-glorious Name. Instead of that we find, to our most just indignation, nothing. Dr. Bernard discusses the various meanings of the word Nature in the Bible, and Professor Driver exhibits what extremely different terms, especially in the Old Testament, are represented by Offer, Offering, and Oblation. Professor Gwatkin adds a brief article on Ordination to what may be called the Ecclesiastical articles of the Dictionary. The word Parable is discussed by Professor König for the Old Testament, and by Dr. Plummer for the New Testament. The second part contains some useful remarks on the difficult work of classifying our Lord's Parables. The article on Paraclete is the chief contribution of the general editor to this volume, and is stronger in etymological than theological value. Professor Salmond writes on the origin and Scriptural and Rabbinical use of the word Paradise, and Professor Brown contributes twelve columns on the Parousia. Professor Findlay presents an elaborate section on St. Paul's doctrine in the article of which we have already noticed the historical section. Some account is first given of modern analyses of the Apostle's doctrine, and a preliminary remark of no small importance is made when the writer reminds us that St. Paul's soteriology and Christology are rooted in his theology. This is true, and it is the justification of an arrangement of St. Paul's teaching which places his doctrine of God in the first place, and his doctrine of man in the second. These sections are followed by others on St. Paul's doctrine of Christ and of Salvation, of the Holy Spirit, the Church, and the Kingdom of God. We note with satisfaction that a survey of St. Paul's Christology as a whole leads the writer to the conclusion that 'there is nothing really surprising if, as seems most probable in both instances, Paul has actually in Rom. ix. 5 and St. Tit. ii. 13 given to Christ the predicate God,' comparing with this ascription a well-

supp
see
'rep
ing,
betw
mon
gift
hum
Holy
not
Find
in re
as a
V
our
have
artic
ment
have
We a
unde
our r
the a
who
with
We r
inter-
of all
gover
can
contri
from
gener
antiqu
be re
volum
parts.

supported reading in St. John i. 18. We are glad also to see that such words are used of our Lord's atoning death as 'representative, justifying, propitiatory, reconciling, sanctifying,' though this last word may suggest some confusion between the unique effects of our Lord's death and the momentous results of His ascension in the bestowal of the gift of the Holy Spirit through His risen and glorified humanity. Indeed we may say that the sections on the Holy Spirit and the Church, especially on the Church, are not so satisfactory to us as some other parts of Professor Findlay's contribution. But we do not desire to be backward in recognizing the value of the doctrinal section of his article as a whole.

We have been compelled to be rigidly severe in curtailing our remarks on many important and valuable articles. We have not, however, intentionally passed over any crucial article, or any specially striking section which ought to be mentioned in stating the grounds of the estimate which we have formed of Dr. Hastings's work. It is a mixed work. We are not in sympathy with the critical assumptions which underlie many of the Old Testament introductory articles, as our readers well know. And we cannot be contented with the allotment of many articles on Biblical theology to writers who have long ago formed conclusions which are at variance with the teaching and organization of the Catholic Church. We must say this plainly, although we are aware that an inter-denominational Dictionary must be dear to the hearts of all who believe that our Lord did not appoint any form of government in particular in His kingdom on earth. But we can sincerely congratulate Dr. Hastings on the valuable contributions which he has collected on theological subjects from some of his large company of writers, and also for the general excellence of the articles in this third volume on antiquities, archæology, biography, and geography. We shall be ready to bestow the same care upon his concluding volume, and to extend the same welcome to its excellent parts.

ART. VIII.—DR. GASQUET AND THE OLD
ENGLISH BIBLE. I.

The Old English Bible, and other Essays. By FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, D.D., O.S.B., Author of *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.* (London, 1897.)

THE inquiry with which these pages are concerned is of some historical and practical importance. Its practical importance lies in the fact that it bears upon controversies which are still undetermined, and the issue of which is of the utmost moment to honest and earnest men. The matters in debate between Rome and England, or between the See of Rome and the Churches of the Roman obedience upon the one hand, and the Church of England and her daughter Churches upon the other, offer no apparent prospect of conclusion. They are, it must ever be remembered, not matters of sentiment; leanings, sympathies, predilections of whatever kind, have nothing immediately to do with them. They are matters of truth and falsehood, the actual truth as to a series of events, an assemblage of conditions, alleged or denied to have occurred in history. The appeal is to history and to the evidence; and the English mind and the Roman are mainly to be distinguished by their different bearing in the presence of that appeal.

It may be that comparatively few men have either means or occasion to decide these matters for themselves by patient and deliberate recourse to history. For the greater number, their attitude is determined providentially from the outset; and they are established in it by certain striking memories, certain salient facts, certain vivid impressions, which leave their minds in no practical doubt. It is important therefore that such facts and memories and impressions as go to the making of practical judgments should be true, that they should be something more than prepossessions, baseless or at best ill-founded. If it can be shown, by processes of critical scholarship, that a common persuasion concerning fact is after all a prepossession merely, without substance or ground in evidence, the proof is a matter of moment, affecting deeply the balance of opinion, and representing, as it may well do, a vast transference of moral weight. The fact that such a result is possible, while it has impressed scholars with the responsibilities of their work, has been to some in every age a temptation of no little power. It has led them, in the

hop
and
mai
thei

trut
to a
tion
Bib
hear
than
achi
by
defa
doul
the
exis
his
brag
them
to s
of it
ever
all t
than
the
thou
the
doul
of th
direc
plete
this
exist
peop
not t
woul
wisd
woul
Sir T
into
say t
one o
the o
a ple

hope of catching men, to fish learnedly in dubious waters, and to propound theories, to advance arguments, and to maintain conclusions of the most hazardous, in order to make their own appear the better reason.

Among the common persuasions concerning fact the truth of which is of such vital moment, none has done more to attach Englishmen to the cause and issue of the Reformation than the belief that they are indebted to it for the open Bible. Nothing has worked more powerfully to divorce their hearts from the mediæval type of discipline and authority than the fact that the first translators of the English Bible achieved their task under the censure of authority, and that by it they were menaced and molested, persecuted and defamed. Of the fact itself and its substantial truth no doubt has been entertained or till of late suggested. That the only English version of the Scriptures known to have existed prior to the Reformation was the work of Wyclif and his followers, taken collectively; that it gave grievous umbrage to the powers that were; that the latter did what in them lay—which was not very much at first—to prevent it, to suppress it, or to restrict its diffusion; that their jealousy of it did not cease until, from conviction or the pressure of events, they were themselves committed to the new order: all this was steadfastly believed. It was something more than a prepossession merely, resting as it did upon one of the soundest traditions of our history. It would be too much, though very little too much, to ascribe to that tradition the consent of five unbroken centuries. At one time, undoubtedly, an opinion got abroad that 'Wyclif's' translation of the Scriptures—that Wyclif was responsible, directly or indirectly, for such a translation, and that pretending to completeness, no soul, until of late, has attempted to deny—that this was something quite different from the version known to exist, by the express licence of certain bishops, in certain people's hands. In simple and pious folk this opinion, though not true, was not at all discreditable, for the truth of the matter would not be thrust upon them, and it would have been small wisdom to venture in search of it. Historically the opinion would be of no moment but for the fact that its sponsor is Sir Thomas More. It will be necessary to look more closely into the testimony of More. For the present it may suffice to say that it is not coherent, and that it is offered in more than one capacity. More appeared for the old order as counsel for the defence, but he does not confine himself to the character of a pleader. We find him intermittently in the witness-box, and

have to distinguish throughout his story between what is given as evidence and what is simply advanced as plausible suggestion. He had, of course, to satisfy his conscience in regard to both; but in the one case it was his moral, in the other his conventional forensic conscience. In matters of history and opinion the rules of advocacy did not require him to go beyond his brief. If the truth were otherwise than as therein set down he need not have known it, and in this instance we may be sure he did not. The responsibility for instructing him, and that truly, lay with those for whom he acted—the bishops of the time; and we gather, from certain casual inadvertencies, that on this particular matter they were wiser than their learned and zealous advocate. Whatever be the worth of this opinion, apart from it the consent of history is quite unbroken. Prior to the Reformation it is in the main a consent of silence. Silence was as far as the Church could go in the acknowledgment of her debt to those whom she had banned. Their work underwent a social translation; it became a treasure, a possession *de luxe*, sought after by the rich and great. The art of the transcriber, the illuminator, was lavished upon it; relieved of the traces—not all traces—of its dubious origin, it was found ‘in kings’ houses’ gloriously apparelled, and not a word was said of the nameless band who had woven for it the glory of English speech. With the progress of the Reformation truth found voice, and the memory of Wyclif and his devoted circle a tardy but unstinting justice. Almost of necessity Wyclif gathered to his own person the common renown. Thenceforth he was revered as a teacher of religion, an apostle of liberty, and a master-builder of England in heart and tongue. The great versions, his most fitting monument, engaged the attention of scholars; and by slow and intermittent inquiry the details of their history were gradually laid bare. In connexion with these early studies the names of Wharton, Lewis, and Waterland, among others, are honourably remembered. Much remained a matter of opinion until, in 1850, speculation gave place to science, and the Wyclif Bible, in a first and final critical edition, issued entire from the Clarendon Press.

This work is one of the glories of English scholarship. Undertaken at the cost of the University Press, it was entrusted to two eminent scholars of the British Museum, Sir Frederick Madden, a palæographer unrivalled in his day, and the Rev. Josiah Forshall. Their researches extended to every known manuscript. With infinite labour they prepared an authoritative text of both recensions, the original and the

190
rev
scr
cop
inv
ing
pre
dat
' M
issu
its
enu
of g
the
Ric
' do
Scri
less
Bibl
been
inva
An
adv
ture
scan
to th
truth
sidia
the
tradi
incom
it as
Test
the
Apoc
(I. x
the
which
pend
speak
certa
lation
limita
of re
from

revised, collating for the purpose upwards of sixty manuscripts. The texts were printed in parallel columns, with copious notes of the various readings. Annexed was an invaluable descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts, summarising their contents and peculiar features. The whole was preceded by a learned introduction, determining problems of date and authorship which, until then, had lain in the dark. 'Madden's magnificent edition,' as Dr. Garnett calls it, was issued in four quarto volumes, and represented, on the part of its editors, the toil of two-and-twenty years.

In their preface Messrs. Forshall and Madden, after enumerating the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman versions, of greater or less extent, describe the two early versions of the Psalms in English, by William de Schorham and Richard Rolle. They conclude that

'down to the year 1360, the Psalter appears to be the only book of Scripture which had been entirely rendered into English. Within less than twenty-five years from this date a prose version of the whole Bible, including as well the apocryphal as the canonical books, had been completed, and was in circulation among the people. For this invaluable gift England is indebted to John Wycliffe' (I. vi.).

An account is given of 'the several steps by which he advanced in the interpretation and diffusion of holy Scripture. The evidence,' as the editors are careful to remark, 'is scanty, and only sufficient, it should be remembered, to afford to the conclusions which it suggests, a presumption of their truth' (*ibid.*). Among these early steps, these studies subsidiary to the entire version, is a certain Commentary upon the Gospels of SS. Matthew, Luke and John. Known traditionally as Wyclif's work, its text of the Gospels was incorporated in the complete version. The editors, accepting it as Wyclif's own, observed in the remainder of the New Testament version such a 'similarity of style' as to 'favour the supposition' that 'the Epistles, the Acts and the Apocalypse' also 'might probably be the work of Wycliffe' (I. xvi.). On the same ground they were led to suggest that the translation of the Old Testament, from the point at which Nicholas de Hereford was obliged apparently to suspend it in 1382, was 'not improbably by Wycliffe' also. They speak, however, of the impossibility of determining 'with certainty the exact share which his own pen had in the translation' (I. vi.). It is necessary, in our day, to draw this limitation much more strictly. Great pains have been spent, of recent years, in distinguishing Wyclif's actual writings from among the many which passed under his name; and

the result has been that the work which prompted the suggestions of Messrs. Forshall and Madden, the aforesaid Commentary on the Gospels, though breathing to the full Wyclif's spirit, can no longer be regarded with any assurance as the actual product of his pen. The impossibility of any sure inference as to his personal share in the literary labour may therefore be taken as absolute. The point, however, is not of much moment, since the question of responsibility is quite untouched. Remembering that the version was completed in Wyclif's lifetime, and was designed as the engine of the reforming movement; that the one name *known* in connexion with it is that of Wyclif's active lieutenant, Nicholas de Hereford; that the unknown coadjutor who did the work long credited to Wyclif, was presumably—and if a surmise as to his identity be correct, was certainly—an intimate of Wyclif's circle; and finally, that contemporaries who refer to the matter of translation at all, lay the responsibility of it, expressly, unanimously, and with the vehemence of indignant knowledge, upon the shoulders of Wyclif himself; in view of all this, we can have no reasonable doubt that whether his hand was engaged or not, his mind and heart were in the work; 'that he took a part,' though only of suggestion and supervision, 'in the labour of producing it, and that the accomplishment of the work must be attributed mainly to his zeal, encouragement and direction.'¹ Looking, then, to his evident responsibility, we cannot find that tradition, in speaking of 'Wyclif's Bible,' has been substantially at fault. It is quite unlikely that, standing as he was upon the edge of the grave, he would or could have done the work himself; it is quite impossible that it should have been done at all independently of his desire and help and counsel.

Wyclif died in 1384, on what would be, in our reckoning, New Year's Eve. Within four years of that event, by the summer of 1388, the version which he had lived to see accomplished was subjected to a complete revision. This revised translation was the achievement of one man, whose identity admits of 'demonstration.'² He was one who was Wyclif's right hand during his closing years, and afterwards the most powerful influence among his followers; a man whose zeal for souls was apostolic, whose learning and capacity commanded respect even among those who set themselves, with dire success, to break his splendid spirit; a man whose memory, long overshadowed by the fame of Wyclif and

¹ Forshall and Madden, I. vi.

² *Ibid.* I. xxv-xxviii.

clouded by his own unhappy end, is hardly the less, to us, illustrious—'the Library of the Lollards,' John Purvey.

So far only is it necessary to go in sketching the conclusions of Messrs. Forshall and Madden. If it be asked whether the evidence, by any possibility, can be made to warrant the ascription of these versions to other than a Wyclifite source, the learned editors have nothing to answer. They would have lifted four polite eyebrows at the mere hint of such a question.

So the matter remained until, in 1894, there appeared an article in the *Dublin Review* traversing the conclusions of Messrs. Forshall and Madden. The author was Dr. Francis Aidan Gasquet, of the Order of St. Benedict. Dr. Gasquet is 'a Roman Catholic scholar' who, in the words of a scholar not obscure, 'has earned honourable distinction for his careful and original work on the history of the Reformation of the English Church.'¹

The purpose of his remarkable paper, as defined by himself, 'is simply to examine into what we really know on this question. To some the very existence of the numerous manuscript copies of the English Scriptures will be accounted sufficient evidence of Wyclif's handiwork, just as the rocks in the valley were to Herodotus proofs of the truth of the legend that the Gods had hurled them from the heights above. But "I know it to be true, for I have seen the rocks," is evidence of a character which, let us hope, is likely to satisfy few in these days of scientific investigation.'²

The reader is invited to

'a brief consideration of the attitude of the English ecclesiastical authorities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries towards a vernacular translation. It might seem unnecessary, perhaps, in these enlightened days to say much upon this; but the same old stories are being repeated almost daily, and writers of various kinds still indulge themselves in the congenial task of embellishing cherished traditions without caring to inquire too particularly, or for that matter at all, into the grounds of their belief.'³

Dr. Gasquet, proceeding in a severer spirit, concludes that 'the rigour with which' the followers of Wyclif 'were treated by Church and State authorities was in no sense caused by' their 'lofty aspiration to propagate the gospel or any peculiar zeal manifested by them for the written word of God' (p. 130); and that on the contrary, and 'in the face of so much distinct evidence, it is extremely difficult not to admit

¹ F. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, p. 204.

² *Old English Bible*, p. 107.

³ *Ibid.* p. 119.

the existence in pre-Reformation days of some well-recognized and perfectly orthodox version or versions of the Holy Scriptures in English' (p. 136).

Such existence admitted, Dr. Gasquet then addresses himself to the question what has become of it.

'If we are to accept the conclusions of those who have hitherto written on the subject, we know of but two English manuscript versions of the entire Bible, those which are now called the Lollard Scriptures, and as such they are printed in Forshall and Madden's great edition. Of any other—that is, any Catholic version—we are asked to believe that there is now no trace whatever. But, I would ask, may it not be possible that under the influence of a preconceived idea, people have gone off on a wrong scent altogether? If we start with a foregone conclusion, we can have little hope that we shall read facts rightly, even though they be as plain as the proverbial pikestaff, and in this instance it appears to me that it has been assumed altogether too hastily that the extant pre-Reformation Scriptures could not have been Catholic, and must have been and were the outcome of the Wyclifite movement. For myself, I may say, that, after much consideration, I have been led to the belief that facts cannot be made to square with this theory as to the origin of these versions of the English Bible. Startling as the assertion may seem to many, I have come to the conclusion that the versions, now known as the Wyclifite Scriptures, are, in reality, only authorised Catholic translations of the Bible. Every circumstance that can be gleaned regarding these manuscripts strengthens this belief' (p. 137).

After debating these circumstances at much length, Dr. Gasquet begs leave to

'sum up very briefly. I have no intention to deny that Wyclif *may* have had something to do with Biblical translations which we do not now possess. My concern is with the actual versions of the translated Scriptures now known to us. Two, and only two, such pre-Reformation vernacular versions are in existence. These have hitherto been ascribed unhesitatingly to Wyclif or his followers, and are known to all under the title of the Wyclifite Scriptures, as printed by Messrs. Forshall and Madden. It will be observed that the ascription of these translations to Wyclif is not based on positive testimony; but, when the case is looked into it really depends on the tacit assumption that there was no Catholic version at all. I desire, rather, to insist on this point, because to many it may seem more than strange that after the immense amount of labour that has been spent upon these manuscripts I should come forward with a theory that runs absolutely counter to the conclusions of many most learned and estimable men. But, if I mistake not, these same conclusions have been formed without any consideration of an alternative. Accordingly, no practical need has been felt by writers who have dealt with the subject to consider a number of facts, which in themselves constitute grave difficulties against the theory of the Wyclifite origin of these versions' (pp. 154-5).

'For my own part, having looked into the matter with some care, I do not see how it is possible to come to any other conclusion than this: that the versions of the Sacred Scriptures, edited by Messrs. Forshall and Madden, and commonly known as Wyclifite, are in reality the Catholic versions of our pre-Reformation forefathers' (p. 155). As to 'the connection of Wyclif personally with any vernacular translation of the Bible,' 'to me it appears that the tradition, for such it has now become, has been built up on a foundation of mistranslation and misunderstanding of Latin documents and misinterpretation of certain somewhat ambiguous expressions' (p. 174). 'Taking the documents and the facts as documents and facts, they tell an intelligible story, but a story that runs counter to the thesis that the extant versions of the English Scriptures are Wyclif's' (p. 178).

This theory, opposed as it is to the testimony of lives of labour and centuries of tradition, has attained, in its six years of existence, a remarkable success. It won, immediately and without much suing, the respectful ear of scholarship. Mr. F. G. Kenyon, in his work, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (pp. 204-8), discusses it at length, concluding, however, that 'it is difficult not to feel that' the author 'has gone upon insufficient evidence.' Already, in the *English Historical Review* (January 1895), it had been examined by Mr. F. D. Matthew, who, after a summary but searching analysis, dismisses it as 'rash.' These criticisms were dealt with in a supplementary paper, which, with the original essay, was incorporated by Dr. Gasquet in a volume called after them, *The Old English Bible* (1897). In this more important dress they came under the notice of Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, who, while pointing out that they contain statements in conflict with facts known to him, regards the controversy as yet unsettled, and scruples, before going into the evidence more deeply, 'to hazard a private judgment.'¹ Taking up Mr. Capes's newly issued work, we observe that in his excellent account of the Wyclif Bible, Dr. Gasquet's theory is held in view throughout, and treated, not indeed as the true, but neither as a plainly impossible solution.² The extent of its popular acceptance is difficult to gauge. Within the Roman Catholic community it is probably universal, nor do we doubt that any well-read Romanist would hasten, on Dr. Gasquet's authority, to pooh-pooh the notion that Wyclif and his followers had anything to do with the extant pre-Reformation Scriptures. As to its effect in a wider sphere,

¹ *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, p. 361, 1897.

² *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, pp. 125-9.

we number among our acquaintance one parish priest who, having to help certain stalwart persons to a reasonable view of the mediæval Church, had recourse on this matter to Dr. Gasquet's pages, and taking the documents and the facts as documents and facts instructed his people accordingly.

For ourselves we may say that, well disposed as any could be to think well of our forefathers and to review their history in temperate blood, we read these essays with surprise and pleasure, both not a little mingled with concern. Instinct with candour, replete with learning, they seemed by a smooth but irresistible pressure to bring conviction home, extruding, as by right of true possession, the prepossessions of a lifetime. We made our mental compliments to Dr. Gasquet upon the performance of a signal feat of intellect. It was impossible, of course, to be at all blind to the consequences of his success. Much has changed with us in England since the days of the Reformer. The English Church has tasted of the scourge which she once laid dutifully upon the back of Wyclif, and has learned, in more ways than one, to number him among her masters. She has cherished his gift, gloried in his fame; she has revered him as a confessor for the truth, nor could she allow any but a lover of the truth to lay a finger upon his grave. It was disquieting to find that condition satisfied, and the trophies of her great dead in peril. Moreover, her integrity as a teacher was evidently involved. The truth, so clear at last, could never have been obscure; and if, by embellishing cherished traditions, she had kept her children in the dark so long, in what could anyone afford to trust her? Plainly there was many a loyal mind which would be no stranger to our disquiet.

So we thought; and meanwhile, having occasion to look into the matter further, its interest developed curiously. We came to the conclusion that these essays deserved a more attentive examination than they had yet received, and that the time had come to undertake it. It appeared that the origin of these early Scriptures was not the only problem in literary history upon which, 'in these days of scientific investigation,' a dry light might usefully be thrown. For indeed, in traversing, at Dr. Gasquet's suit, this rugged ancient valley, we came upon 'rocks' whose presence, in default of any natural explanation, we could only ascribe, with old Herodotus, to the agency of the gods. They will be found, at the least, to merit description.

*To be conclude*d*.*

ART. IX.—A REVIEW OF IRISH HISTORY.

A Review of Irish History: in Relation to the Social Development of Ireland. By JOHN PATRICK GANNON. (London, 1900.)

AN excellent book indeed. There are few who know so much of Irish history as not to derive information from its pages, and even those who are acquainted with all the facts of all the periods through which the *Review* conducts them will admit that the sequence and inner meaning of the whole has never been presented to them in so complete and interesting a fashion. Irish antiquarianism has been diligent enough; and in later times has become quite sane and reasonable, and informed itself upon general history and the principles of human development. But so far as we are acquainted with Irish annals, the particular record of events as they occurred has generally excluded the broad view of their meaning; or, on the other hand, the political and legal aspect of the history has lost sight of its human interest. The author of the present work must be a man of high education, trained to moderate statement and width of combination, without losing the power of impartial sympathy or the gift of conveying that feeling to his readers even in the most general and impersonal summing of results.

We are, of course, aware that our English temper has sometimes led us to turn from Irish affairs, whether past or present, with impatience. This has also been the case in respect to foreign history; therefore foreigners do not always regard our judgment of them or of our superiority to them with entire approval. Perhaps we too often give to our Irish fellow-subjects along with that closer view of our prosperity which socially and geographically belongs to them, a closer contact also with our self-satisfaction which few peoples are more sensitive to feel. But we must plead for ourselves that in contemporary affairs their divisions and disunions afford some excuse for impatience; and that in the world of books, where the peaceful student should have no difficulty in calm judgment, the history of Ireland has been set before him with great want of unity or historic sequence. He is thus deprived of the power even to remember it, not to say deduce from it any understanding of its meaning and effects. Those who on our recommendation will undertake the easy and delightful task of reading Mr. Gannon's short volume, written as it is in

an admirable style, will find that he has done much to remove such objections.

The work is not indeed a history of Ireland, but a review. At the same time the author shows in several passages his graphic power of describing life, and bringing before us the past as what once was present. We believe he would be perfectly capable of writing for us a history of the country not unworthy in its relation of events and its judgment of their results to be compared with Mommsen's *Rome*. To such a work the present might form an introduction. If he should ever produce it, those who wish to speak about Irish matters with the information which the masters of Irish destinies should possess will have to read it. Meanwhile the duty applies in full measure to the *Review*.

Of all the provoking and dangerous traits of character which the Celtic peasant offers to the Saxon, be he landlord or ruler or only critic, there are two which exceed the rest in universal prevalence. The first is the perversity with which he not only refuses obedience to the law of the land when tempted to gain some advantage to himself, but absolutely bestows his sympathy on those who infringe it by crime, and shields them at the cost of his personal danger. The other is the obstinate conservatism, inconsistent though it might seem with indifference to law, with which he retains his old ways and habits at whatever expense of discomfort and privation. The root of both these phenomena is shown in the very first chapter of the *Review*, where we learn that a kind of free-and-easy law of custom, half natural and half legal, ruled the Celts in ancient times.

As we all know, the tribal system then prevailed.¹ It was not peculiar to Ireland, but was the common inheritance of that great Celtic race which spread through so much of Europe and waged war with the Southern civilizations both of Greece and Rome. Beaten back by supreme efforts, it yet left its record of fear in the histories of both countries, and maintained its place beyond the Roman and Grecian borders, where it awaited the inevitable conquest of arms and of civilization which came in their time to Galatia, to Gaul, to Britain, but not to Ireland. Ireland was very far from the centre of imperial force, and the people who considered the Britons to be divided by the whole world from them would think of Ireland as beyond the world altogether. Besides, the power of expansion of the Roman, as of every empire, must have its period in point of time, and its measure in point

¹ *Review of Irish History*, p. 32 sq.

of
any
But
outs
the
Chr
to it
stitu
well
after
in c
woul
miss
sure
conq
the
all h
almo
leave
what
ready
was y
T
existe
forme
indivi
paym
cases
to sup
lavish
belong
even
ber of
succes
to the
alike ;
all the
and un
nursing
relation
Th
this sy
prised

of distance, both of which were reached by Rome before any effort was made to reduce Ireland. That was unfortunate. But Ireland was not thereby deprived, like so many countries outside the Roman world, of the blessing of true religion ; on the contrary, the peculiar strength and zeal which early Irish Christianity displayed may be attributed in no small degree to its insular peculiarities and its combination with the institutions in which its people had been trained. We may well doubt whether if Imperial Rome first and Papal Rome afterwards had early forced their discipline upon Ireland, both in common life and ecclesiastical, the neighbouring lands would have had the same cause to thank the zealous Irish missionaries as that which in fact they received. But assuredly Ireland itself would have been the gainer by a Roman conquest. Our author shows good reason for thinking that the high civilization of early Christian Ireland, which he with all his countrymen look back on with so just a pride, was almost wholly ecclesiastical. It was hindered at home from leavening the common life of the land by a social system which, whatever attractions it may possess for those whose fancy is ready to pronounce the former times to be better than these, was yet wholly inconsistent with social progress.

The tribal system in general, but more particularly the existence of septs, by an aggregation of which the tribe was formed, rested upon a basis of kinship to which the idea of individual property was very subordinate.¹ The objectionable payment of rent was not indeed wholly unknown in certain cases ;² nor was the head of a tribe left wholly without means to support his station and discharge the requirements of a lavish hospitality.³ But the land of the tribe as a whole belonged to the tribesmen. The chief was not necessarily or even generally the eldest son of his predecessor, but a member of the same family chosen by the tribesmen as tanist or successor. Also, primogeniture was not recognized as a title to the occupation of tribal land, but the children inherited alike ; and while kinship was thus honoured as the basis of all the system, it was traversed by the custom of fosterage, and under Christianity by that of gossipred, by which the nursing family and the god-parents assumed a closeness of relationship that sometimes seemed to exceed that of nature.

The spirit of unity and of mutual duty seemed under this system to lose more and more of its force as it comprised larger numbers of the inhabitants and wider districts

¹ *A Review of Irish History*. p. 26.

² *Ibid.* p. 22.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 23-7 sq.

of the country. The sept was closer than the tribe, the tribe than the great tribe, the great tribe than the provincial kingdom, while the so-called High King or Monarch of Ireland had very little power to enforce his authority unless he possessed the natural qualities of a genuine leader, which the quick-minded Celt has been ever ready to recognize and to follow under whatever deficiencies of title or legal claim.¹

The well-known appreciation of justice which the Celt displays can hardly be derived from the system of law under which his primitive ancestors lived. For these the idea of crime would seem to have been absent for want of the existence of a king or any form of state representing the Divine Source of justice. There was in primitive Celtic idea no such prayer as 'Give the King Thy judgments, O Lord.' Under the Brehon law, which the judge of each tribe declared, all injuries, civil or criminal, were reparable by compensation paid to the individual if he were alive to receive it, to his kinsmen if he were dead, to his lord if he were a bondman.²

This, on the whole, was a strange system, bearing on its face the need of further development. It is hard to give it any name derived from the political history of other nations. It could not be properly called theocracy or autocracy or aristocracy or democracy. How it ever came to exist, or who were the clever people who devised its elaborate arrangements, is a lost mystery to us; like the question who invented all the beautiful sounds and ingenious forms of language, while we with all our civilization cannot invent a harmonious new word. Whatever the deficiencies of the tribal system in our view, it must have been thoroughly adapted to the primitive Celtic nature, since it existed as widely as the race, and gave unhampered scope to its tastes and character.

The Celts were no exceptions at any time to the prevalence of religion among mankind. But the nature worship which existed among them before St. Patrick cannot have met their spiritual wants; for the rapidity with which his preaching was accepted throughout the land has scarce any precedent elsewhere. Perhaps the natural reverence of the Celt for a great man was attracted by the ascetic greatness of the saint and his companions. Perhaps the records of the blessed Life of Christ which we know him from his own writings to have believed and preached so fervently, caught the enthusiasm of the race. Perhaps the spirit of kinship on which Irish life was ordered made it peculiarly easy for

¹ *Review of Irish History*, p. 24.

² *Ibid.* p. 26.

the
prin
'him
he
plac
the
acce
failu
turie
Mas
and
earth
them
Chri
Chri
shou
the
Irela
unch
Papa
cling
even
how
Chri
more
gove
pliab
ness
duty
but
was
they
tution
They
Roma
upon
was
Chri
muni
its ow
the s
vener
and
could

the chief to lead his tribe; by the further extension of that principle, which the New Testament expresses in the words 'himself believed and his whole house,' or 'he was baptized, he and all his.' Whatever the reason, the conversion took place. But we cannot help contrasting the ease with which the unarmed power of Christian love induced the Celts to accept the greatest changes in the highest matters, with the failure of the mightiest earthly force throughout all the centuries to move them in secular things.

However, the loving apostles of Christianity, like their Master Himself, abstained from making themselves rulers and dividers over the Irish in earthly things. In matters of earthly concern they accepted such things as were set before them. That many observances connected with the pre-Christian nature worship should have received, as it were, Christian baptism and linger on to this day, and that some should have even been incorporated under new names into the Church's course of commemorations, is common to Ireland with other countries. Nature worship, somewhat unchristianized, is said to be found at present in the whilom Papal territory of Italy. And the folklore of Ireland still clings in the minds of that imaginative peasantry, and may even now be discovered among them by those who know how to set about the task. But the adoption by early Irish Christianity of the existing rule touched even larger and more practical matters than these—namely, those of Church government. It was not that Irish Christianity was more pliable than the Christianity of other places—for the willingness to accept whatever was fit and useful was a habit and duty which the Lord practised and laid upon His Apostles—but that the world in which Irish Christianity found itself was different. The Apostles found the Roman world in which they worked providentially covered with methods and institutions which admirably led the way for the Church system. They founded it, and it overspread the face of the empire as Roman conquest, with the laws and institutions that followed upon conquest, had covered all the countries before it. Ireland was occupied by no such systematic government. The Christian teachers and law-givers within the empire used its municipal and provincial governments, and repeated them in its own sacred sphere, so effectually as to be able to replace the secular government when it decayed, in a still more venerable and permanent form, by episcopacy and its methods and boundaries of work. But Irish saints and founders could not wait for a new Rome to arise and perform the

office of subjugation and of rule which the old Rome had not accomplished for Ireland. They worked with the methods which the secular world offered to their hands. These, as we have seen, did not belong to a social and political development at all corresponding to the Roman, and did not cover Ireland in every corner with a uniform network of ordered government. They had but the tribal system; and they worked it as an instrument, just as they or any other humble and peaceful men would have worked the Roman forms of life and government had they possessed them.¹ Nor were the advantages small which the tribal system afforded. Under it Irish monasticism grew and prospered side by side with the sept, and, indeed, as a species of sept in itself. Luxury and laxity were not practised as they had been long practised by wealthy Rome. Asceticism was congenial to the nature of the poor Irish; and Irish monasticism, with its Irish habits and methods, vehemently loved and clung to, furnished a sacred soldiery which in the terrible confusions of Europe was long pre-eminent for daring and success in the Holy War.

But Europe recovered itself from the horrors of the ninth and tenth centuries, when every beneficent influence and institution had gone so utterly to pieces that the end of the world seemed at hand. The Church rallied with the Papacy at its head. Wild nations, among whom the Normans were by far the most eminent, who had been the pirates of the times of confusion, settled down as the conquerors and rulers of the succeeding period and the very good friends of the Pope. There was something wondrously congenial in the nature of these formidable warriors for the feudal system, in which the Church also found a powerful position, not indeed spiritual or apostolic, yet effective according to the times. Celtic tribalism and Celtic monasticism furnished but a guerilla mode of warfare either in civic or religious life in comparison to mighty feudalism, which turned Europe into a species of camp in which the possession of the land was dependent on the performance of warlike duties, with the King at the head: a species of foretaste of those vast modern armaments in which a whole people is called to serve.

Already, before the feudal warriors made their inevitable assault upon a country so ill-prepared to resist them as Ireland, the incursions and settlements of the Danes had displayed the weakness of Irish resources. In the resistance, never completely effective, which the native Irish offered to these

¹ *Review of Irish History*, pp. 31 sqq.

fier
Da
tha
Ch
Ch
wh
out
the
nat
of
the
the
rec
the

tom
terr
diff
the
the
hinc
in p
Eng
a p
cert
wer
but
acce
the
foun
prop
equa
thief
Irela
orga
had
prop
yet
be su

E
prop
does
part
modi
and

fierce warriors, the Irish Church gave but little help. And the Danes, more capable of the practices of peace and commerce than the Irish themselves, showed, when they settled down as Christian merchants, no great willingness to recognize a Church which was not organized according to the models which they had known elsewhere. But this was but one sign out of many that the diocesan system was better fitted than the tribal for the maintenance of religion in a Christian nation, and that it was better for their own sakes and for that of the people that the Irish clergy should fall into line with the rest of Christendom. The change was effected just before the Norman conquest of Ireland, and had its effect in the recognition which that race always extended to the Church of the land.

It is not indeed to be thought that Irish bishops, accustomed to the tribal system, and Irish laity, so unconscious of territorial obligations, should all at once fall into a system so different. The Latinized character of the Church throughout the Middle Ages seems to have weakened her power in the parts of Ireland beyond the pale of English rule, and hindered the influence which religion might else have had in putting an end to the obstinate misunderstanding between English and Irish which even now is not extinct. By it a people who had to their own great benefit accepted a certain system of law ruled over another people whose notions were wholly different, yet never understood the difference, but unconsciously assumed that ideas which were so perfectly accepted by them as to seem obvious were not accepted by the subject race at all. Such misunderstandings are to be found elsewhere. To the Socialist it appears evident that property is thieving; while to the possessors of property it is equally plain that whoever utters that sentiment is himself a thief. The Irishman is not a thief. But in the times when Ireland was organized upon Irish ideas, however imperfect the organization might be, the idea of private property in land had not been developed. The maxim of Drummond that property has its duties as well as its rights, is now recognized: yet by many selfish owners even that recognized maxim may be suspected of Socialism.

But before we come to apply even that modification to property, there is a stage in which private ownership of land does not exist at all without the recognition of rights on the part of the public, or some part of the public, which seriously modify the claim of the occupier to do what he will with it, and even in certain contingencies take it away from him or

from his kindred altogether. Such was ownership under the tribal system ; not such under the feudal. There everything was definite. Obligations of service and rights of enjoyment were strictly understood. The soldier, to be sure, might have his own enthusiasm, but he was bound to serve. And if the lord to whom he rendered his service was beaten in the contest his dependents must suffer with him, but not to the degree of confiscation. The tribesman also had to serve ; but he served his own kinsman. He gave the service of blood relationship, which, though it can never compensate for the want of the discipline which feudalism provided, yet has its own peculiar enthusiasm. But it was hard, indeed, if when his tribal head was beaten his poor means of living, his partnership or right of use in the tribe land were forcibly taken away without any consideration of his very existence. Meanwhile the Norman and English conquerors and settlers were as little able to conceive or understand his notions of property as they were to understand those tribal proprietorships in which not one alone, but many, partook. Individual proprietorships involving duties to the feudal superior, and through him to the State, appeared to them evidently right. And much of the confiscation which has left such an abiding consciousness of injury upon the Celtic mind and established a mental sore which after events have too effectually kept open, was probably done under the idea that those who had no feudal rights to show, or who had forfeited them through the fault of their chief, could not have any rights at all. The common rights of humanity were of little account in those times.¹

It is very easy to see that the free-and-easy method of dealing with tribal rights, which the Celtic people regarded as pure plunder, prepared the way for great reactions. In the hours of England's weakness, and while the vigilance of her kings and nobles was occupied at home or was asleep, the Celtic charm, which has so constantly shown itself able to assimilate to itself the fierce conqueror and take him captive like Greece of old, kept gradually eating away the Norman rigour. The Englishman was bidden by repeated laws to beware of adopting Irish ways and to keep himself apart. But how could he cultivate his land without using the cheapest

¹ 'Before the flight of the earls the King's Attorney-General in Ireland had . . . fully recognized the original rights of the tribesmen regarded as freeholders. . . . Nevertheless, the attainder of the earls and their companions was followed by the forfeiture of the greater part of Ulster.'—*Review of Irish History*, pp. 138, 139.

labour that he could find ; and how could he restrain himself from forming the friendships and family alliances that charmed him most, or using the pleasures of life which revealed themselves in this lower sphere ? Many a proud Englishman at this day feels the charm of foreign life, and, like the captive soldiers of Crassus of whom Horace tells us, forgets the calls of home and country. Irish chieftains, too, who had been ready enough to accept the position of feudal superiors when the prevalence of Norman power had made it their advantage to claim it, fell willingly back again into that of Celtic tribal chieftaincy, to which they had been bred and to which their habits conformed, whenever the changes and chances of Irish history gave good hopes—as they very often did—of expelling the stranger or restricting his power.

This, to be sure, was all very long ago. The Irish of the present day have been drilled by no gentle process to understand the rights of property. The families, whether of chiefs or tribesmen who lost their rights in old times, have generally passed away or cannot be identified. But the general idea remains in the native mind that the land belongs to the Irish, and was wrongly taken from them ; and people who have no tribal rights whatever, and would not have any if the ancient system were re-established, are quite willing to serve themselves as heirs to all the rights of ancient Ireland, and to enforce them by every means which the existing English law and constitution puts in their hands, and by many which it does not recognise. So that whatever arguments peasant proprietorship has to advance on abstract grounds, or from the example of other countries, are reinforced in the Irish case by the remembrances of history in a people who do not forget. Thus the scant attention which was paid in old times by English conquerors to the rights of the tribe is fully equalled by the scant attention which the Irish tenants who now fill the place of Irish tribesmen pay to the rights of the landlord.

The Reformation in Ireland marks no such era in the social life of the people as that of England. Reformers could no doubt have conceivably furnished arguments to the reason or excitements to the religious faculty which might have appealed with power to a people so clever and so religiously disposed as the Irish. They had done so to the Welsh. But where in Ireland were the reformers of such ability and earnestness as to provide either arguments or excitements ? The quarter from which the Reformation was recommended in Ireland would have tainted it for the Irish mind, even if it had been unadulterated gospel. It is a mere farce to represent

Celtic Ireland as having ever rejected the Reformation. It never was offered to Celtic Ireland. Moreover, certain outward and visible accompaniments of the movement were such as to put the Celts against it without knowing what its real teaching was. The monasteries, though they never held in Ireland the importance as institutions of charity which they held in England, yet were of some importance, and when lost were doubtless missed. And though the property of Irish monasteries was small in comparison to those of England, they were not below the notice of grasping nobles, not always from among the English colony. There were no martyrs of the Reformation in Ireland as in England, and on the whole it is hard to tell on what the movement could have based itself in that country save those of presenting an open Bible and a Prayer-Book in the English vernacular, the expulsion of false doctrines, and the establishment of constant public devotion.

Doubtless these were reasons great and sufficient. But only on those to whom the Bible and the Prayer-Book were presented in their own tongue could they operate with any success ; and this was not the case with the Irish. It was not to be expected that they would regard the Reformation with acceptance or favour, in the name of the Lord whom they knew and loved, because a few greedy English nobles, in whose increase of property they had no interest, had driven off the monks and enjoyed the spoils, or because the English settlers in their country, who were no great friends to them, had the happiness of possessing the Bible and the Prayer-Book in a language which the Irish did not understand. Whether it would have been possible for the truest and most self-denying missionary spirit, the spirit of S. Paul himself, who would not even 'live of the gospel' at the expense of those who were willing to support him, could have spread the Reformation in Ireland in the name of England is very doubtful, in spite of the kindly response which true goodness even in Protestants has ever awakened in the Irish mind. But, alas ! the trial has seldom been made on the diocesan or even on the parochial scale, and never upon the national. And it speedily came to pass that the spirit of war was introduced into religious controversy with an effect which has hardly anywhere in Europe wholly departed—if anywhere, not in Ireland.

This was not wholly the fault of the Reformation. Long before the Reformation Catholic Christianity had not only adopted the aid of temporal power, but had wielded it herself. The first Crusades were the noblest form of the alliance

of the arm of the spirit with that of the flesh. But the crusading temper proved capable of corruption, and was applied to unrelenting persecution of heretics at home. And the Papacy in its temporal character had by the time of the Reformation absolutely lowered the idea of spiritual power to that of the most ostentatious and ambitious as well as the most formidable and relentless of the earthly monarchies of the world. Even still it keeps fast hold of its claim to temporal power. Protestantism cannot be accused of making the first resort to weapons of earthly war, when the Church which she contended with had been armed with them before Protestantism existed. But, whoever began the fight, it came to pass that the Reformation, instead of making peace in Ireland, where there had been war, added only additional vehemence and a further element of disunion and danger beside those which had existed before, to the separation of the Celt and the Saxon.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the religious war, as it existed in Ireland, derived its cause and meaning only from Irish sources, and was but an excuse on the one side for seizing more land and power and keeping it more obstinately, and on the other for striving with less compunction to get it back by any means. The general contest which was going on in Europe must be remembered. The Pope's treatment of Elizabeth, and the spirit with which she struck back; the persecution of Protestantism, both in Spain and France—these things, as well as land hunger, influenced the English colony in Ireland, nerved their arm, and checked their pity; the Irish, on the other hand, received some material help and more verbal encouragement from Spain, France, and the Pope. It is a fact admitted on all sides that Protestant people advanced the arts of living far more rapidly and effectually than those which remained Roman. Therefore, when by the confiscations of Elizabeth and James I., by the conquests of Cromwell and of William III., and by the expulsions of Louis XIV. and other so-called friends of Catholicism, large Protestant infusions were introduced in Ireland from England and Scotland and France, they came not only imbued with a general hatred of Romanism and contempt of the Irish people who favoured it, but also with industry and energy and self-respect which made them potent examples to the country. They might have 'paid their footing,' as the Irish express it, well, heavy as was the cost of it, if only the spirit of war which burnt in their own bosoms, as well as in those of the native Irish, had allowed their influence to spread.

Mr. Gannon is so just and generous in appraising the performances of the Protestant minority during the eighteenth century that even many Protestants, ashamed of the remembrance of the penal laws, would scarce have said so much. But certain it is that the small minority who ruled Ireland during that period worked great wonders among many difficulties, most of which were due to the selfishness of English trade and to the cupidity of English place-hunters and scheming statesmen. They furnished far more than their proportion, not only to the literature which fed the minds of the existing generations of the Anglo-Saxon race, but even to that select part which remains permanently marked for posterity. And although we are well aware of the change which the Union, the improved means of travelling, and other causes, have made by the absorption of Irish individuality in that of mighty England, it is not wonderful that Irishmen feel ashamed when they compare the present literary position of their country, whether as regards writers or readers, with the records of the eighteenth century.

Our author, near the close of his suggestive volume,¹ declares his belief that if Ireland, 'at the close of the Middle Ages, had come under the protection and influence of a Latin, or still more a Celto-Latin, nation like France, she would have much more readily embraced its ideas and imbibed its civilization than she has done with those of England.' And he draws an enticing picture of what Irish towns and their habits might in that case have been. It may well be; but we do not feel quite so sure of his imaginations of what might have been as we are of his wise generalization of what has been and is. Has Brittany so entirely embraced the ideas of France, or Wales and the Highlands so turned from those of England? And does the author allow sufficiently for the influence of climate and Lord Beaconsfield's 'melancholy ocean'? We allow that if the supremacy of France could have checked the fatal working of the curse of drink, more noxious to the Irish than all its oppressors combined, he might well wish that France had ruled her, and we should heartily concur. But, alas! we fear that the influence of France would have been in that respect only what the influence of England has been, and that either might be symbolized by the well-known story of the drunken man who found his drunken friend in the gutter, and said, 'I can't lift you up, but I can lie down beside you.'

In default of the race of suzerains who, as our author

¹ *Review of Irish History*, p. 269.

believes, would have been best capable of ruling and developing Ireland and her native inhabitants, he sets forth very fairly that which she might learn from England and the English: no small amount, as our readers will easily imagine. Nor will they be unaware, in this year of the Queen's visit—when, as some Irishman says, Ireland has been discovered by the English in the year 1900—that England has much to gain from Celtic Ireland, not only in the way of material service, but of intellectual and spiritual gift. Except in time of war, the material service comes most efficiently from the North of Ireland, where the Scotch and English colonists—if not mixed, as they often are, with Irish blood, yet at least influenced by the Irish atmosphere—produce, as capable judges¹ have allowed, as devoted and enterprising workers as a world-wide Empire could wish for its numberless occasions. But the spiritual and intellectual gifts come from all Ireland, and perhaps chiefly from the West and the South. They come in all sorts of forms—some objectionable, as occasionally in Parliament, but some welcome—to enliven the camp and the court of justice, the dinner party, and the pulpit. Truly it is pitiful to think that while Ireland can furnish such qualities, and England such a field for their exercise, there should still be so much misunderstanding on either side.

Yet we must not exaggerate. When we compare the relations of England and Ireland, especially since the Reformation came to quicken every difference already existing into bitterness and into action, with those of other countries in which similar contrasts of race or religion have existed, there is some room for regarding Irish history with leniency and the Irish question with hopefulness. France has had her massacres, her persecutions, and wholesale banishments; Germany her Thirty Years' War; Italy and Spain their extermination of Protestants. But in Ireland, however it comes, the two races and the two religions bear witness by their very contentions with each other and within themselves, that they are both very much alive, and retain their vigour unimpaired.

To readers and writers of the *Church Quarterly* the element of Irish society—or shall we say the regiment in the Irish battle?—which does or ought to excite most sympathy is probably the Irish Church. She has had her full share in the errors and abuses, the sufferings and vicissitudes and efforts after good of the past centuries, and not least of that to which in this number of our Review we bid good-bye. In the last

¹ *E.g.*, the Marquis of Dufferin, himself an excellent example.

generation of this last of the centuries came her disestablishment and time of greatest trial. It still continues, but so far as it has gone she has battled through with some credit, even from those who loved her least; and from just critics like our author she may count upon kindly notice. Those Church-people who are capable of taking any account either of past history or present facts will know how many are her difficulties. But we hope she may be delivered from the party spirit which thinks and speaks in religion with the language of old wars, and may labour not only for peace, but for that Christian peace about which both Rome and popular Protestantism seem often to care so little—the peace of mutual understanding.

ART. X.—SOME MODERN WRITERS ON THE ATONEMENT.

The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought. A Theological Symposium. By FREDERIC GODET, ADOLF HARNACK, AUGUSTE SABATIER, LYMAN ABBOTT, WASHINGTON GLADDEN, T. T. MUNGER, F. W. FARRAR, W. H. FREMANTLE, W. F. ADENEY, R. J. CAMPBELL, A. CAVE, MARCUS DODS, P. T. FORSYTH, SILVESTER HORNE, R. F. HORTON, JOHN HUNTER, BERNARD J. SNELL. (London, 1900.)

THIS book contains seventeen essays on the Atonement, written by the authors whose names appear on the title-page. The essays, we are told by the 'publisher's note' at the beginning of the volume, originally appeared as 'a series of articles' 'contributed to *The Christian World* newspaper during the winter of 1899-1900.' They are 'intended,' it is added, 'as a discussion,' 'not as a theological ultimatum'; and 'their object is not to dictate to, but to educate public opinion.'

A glance through the list of contributors to the volume leads a reader to anticipate very different opinions and very different degrees of ability in the essays. A perusal of the book verifies this anticipation. The ablest of the articles are perhaps those by Dr. Godet and Dr. Harnack, while the most annoying in its false and overstrained rhetoric and general confusing of the issues is that by the Dean of Canterbury.

b
3
p
v
A
p
a
It
H
all
Eu
ass
do
an
an
bre
ma
reg
in
up
to
to
beir
Fati
decl
Can
of
love
teach
repre
was
of the
Patro
crucifi
capab
Script
God
Sir H
ism a
cup in
VOI

On the whole the book is well printed and easy to read, but some very ugly misprints have caught our eye on pages 36, 41, 47, 51, 52, 72, 97, 199, 206, 207, 211 (nine on one page), 221, 287, 290, 292, 294.

I. A noticeable feature in several of these essays, as in very much which has been written elsewhere about the Atonement, is a tendency to imagine that an assertion of one point necessarily implies the denial of something else. Such a tendency, indeed, is not confined to writings on this subject. It is surprising to notice how often a misconception about the Holy Trinity or the Incarnation has been due to a failure to allow for two co-ordinate truths, or a mistake about the Holy Eucharist to an absence of practical recognition that the assertion that the consecrated elements are bread and wine does not in the least involve a denial that they are the body and blood of Christ, and the assertion that they are the body and blood of Christ is no step towards a denial that they are bread and wine. In many other matters the same tendency may be observed. As we have said, it is very marked with regard to the Atonement, and there are many instances of it in this book. A good deal that is said in it is really based upon an assumption that, because it is true and Scriptural to ascribe to the death of Christ the reconciliation of sinners to God, it is neither true nor Scriptural to speak of God being reconciled to sinners; and that, because God the Father most certainly is love, there is no truth in the declaration of His wrath. Thus we find the Dean of Canterbury not only repudiating perverted ideas of a wrath of God the Father which was not at the same time full of love, but also using such language as the following:

‘We reject as utterly false, and absolutely contrary to the whole teaching of Scripture, those presentations of the Atonement which represent GOD THE FATHER as full of wrath and vengeance, which was only averted by the tenderness of GOD THE SON. The language of the Augsburg Conference, that Christ died *ut reconciliaret nobis Patrem*, and of our own Fourth Article, that “He suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried *to reconcile the Father unto us*” may be capable of being rightly explained. But this is *not* the language of Scripture, which invariably says that Christ died “to reconcile (not God to us, but) us to God.” When we read such lines as those of Sir Henry Wotton:—

“One rosy drop from Jesu’s heart
Was worlds of seas to quench God’s ire.”

..... or when we read such ghastly and revolting anthropomorphism as the phrase of..... Mr. Spurgeon, that “Christ took the cup in both His hands, and at one tremendous draught of love

drank damnation dry" when, I say, we read such phrases, they seem to be absolutely deplorable if they be placed side by side with the revelation that "God is Love," or with such passages as "I trust in the MERCY of God for ever and ever." . . . Much, perhaps, of the error which I am combating may be due to the myriad-fold-repeated phrase that God forgives us "*for Christ's sake*." But although a true meaning may be attached to that expression, it is *not* the expression of St. Paul, who uses the far deeper and truer phrase that "God *in Christ* forgave us." The statement that God did anything *for Christ's sake* does not once occur in the New Testament. That God *in Christ* saves us, according to His mercy, is a very different conception' (pp. 36-9).

'καταλλαγή . . . explains itself, if only we bear in mind that it is not a reconciliation of *God to us*, but of *us to God*' (pp. 53-4).

So, too, Dr. Forsyth says :

'We have outgrown the idea that God has to be reconciled. . . . We have further left the idea behind that the satisfaction of Christ was made either to God's wounded honour or to His punitive justice' (pp. 64, 67).

Dr. Abbott, again, writes :

'No theory of the Atonement can be correct which represents it as a method of appeasing God's wrath, or satisfying His justice, or meeting the requirements of His law, or devised as a substitute for punishment due to infraction of that law' (pp. 97-8).

'The object of the Atonement is the purification of man, not the appeasement of God' (p. 103).

Now, no emphasis can be too strongly laid on the fact that the Atonement is the work of the love of God the Father as well as of the love of God the Son. 'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world ; but that the world should be saved through Him.'¹ No emphasis, again, can be too strongly laid on the fact that the obstacle to forgiveness was in the sinful state of man. 'If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life ; and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.'² 'You, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death.'³ But it does not in the least follow that there is no such thing as the reconciliation of God the Father and the

¹ St. John iii. 16-17.

² Rom. v. 10-11.

³ Col. i. 21-22.

appeasing of His wrath. Full of love as God the Father is, He must still, in virtue of His unchangeable holiness, be hostile to sin, and the sinner must be under His wrath. We 'were by nature,' says St. Paul, 'children of wrath.'¹ 'God, be propitiated to me a sinner,' are the words ascribed by our Lord to the publican in the parable.² For ourselves, we always prefer the phrase 'man is reconciled to God' as being the language expressly used in Holy Scripture. When it is asserted that it is untrue to say 'God is reconciled to man,' we are constrained to defend this phrase also, as expressive of the same truth that by the death of Christ forgiveness is provided for the sin which separates man from God and causes even the love of God to be in a state of hostility to that which is abhorrent to His holiness. In the wise words of Bishop Pearson :

'We are said to be reconciled unto God when God is reconciled, appeased, and become gracious and favourable unto us ; and Christ is said to reconcile us unto God when He hath moved and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when He hath appeased Him and restored us unto His favour. Thus "when we were enemies we were reconciled to God : " that is, notwithstanding He was offended with us for our sins, we were restored under His favour "by the death of His Son."

'Whence appeareth the weakness of the Socinian exception that in the Scriptures we are said to be reconciled unto God, but God is never said to be reconciled unto us. For by that very expression it is understood that he which is reconciled in the language of the Scriptures is restored unto the favour of him who was formerly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled.'³

In an admirable statement by the Bishop of Gloucester :

'If sin really be all that we have seen it to be, must not the love of God have been, as it were, held back from its manifestation to the sinner ; and does it not bewray a very shallow and inadequate estimate of God's righteousness, and of His holy hatred of sin, to maintain, as is now freely maintained, that the Atonement does not involve the reconciliation of God to mankind as well as of mankind to God, and that one of the Articles of our Church is to be condemned for the assertion that reconciliation of the Father was one of the blessed purposes and issues of the work of our redeeming Lord?

'If we are to presume to find fault with the language of the Second Article, it can only be on account of its mention of one,

¹ Eph. ii. 3.

² St. Luke xviii. 13, 'Ο Θεός, δάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.

³ Pearson, *An Exposition of the Creed*, article x.

rather than of both, sides of the reconciliation. That reconciliation, we must believe, was effected in heaven as well as in earth. When the Holy Angels announced peace on earth, they in effect announced that God could now again regard with the plenitude of unhindered love the race into which the Son of His love was born. No sober and reverent thinker whose soul is truly penetrated by the conviction of sin, and has learnt to realise its exceeding sinfulness, can ever dispense with what has been called the objective, as contrasted with the subjective, side of reconciliation, or can fail to crave for the assurance that his prayer goes upward, through Jesus, to a Father whose tender love is no longer stayed and hindered in its manifestation by the dreadful energies of sin.¹

It is, then, a very serious fault in some of the essays before us that they are pervaded by, and sometimes express, the utterly false view that to assert the reconciliation of man to God by the death of Christ involves the denial of the reconciliation of God to man. In others of the essays, we rejoice to observe, this confusion of thought is not to be found. The Dean of Ripon—and, in view of what has been usually understood as to his theological position and of some other statements in his present article, we desire to call particular attention to the fact—uses these weighty words:

‘The same righteousness and love which beams upon the repentant and believing soul with forgiveness and complacency cannot but wear towards the rebellious, unloving spirit the aspect of displeasure. Repentance and faith change for us the face of God.² And thus we may understand the passages which speak of this change. “God saw their works, that they turned from their evil ways, and God repented of the evil that He had said that He would do unto them, and He did it not.”

‘If, then, the death of Christ, viewed as the culminating point of His life of love, is the destined means of repentance for the whole world, we may say, also, that it is the means of securing the mercy and favour of God, of procuring the forgiveness of sins. And then the sacrificial language of the apostolical epistles becomes full of meaning to us. Take such an expression as that of Hebrews ix. 23: “It was necessary that the heavenly things themselves should be cleansed with better sacrifices than these.” The heavens and all that is in them, the aspect of God Himself, are lurid and dark till they are purged for us by that sacrifice which ensures alike our repentance and the favour of God. The sacrifice is not less real because it is the sacrifice of self. When, by the light of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we put aside the shadowy and unreal notions which beset

¹ Ellicott, *Salutary Doctrine*, pp. 79–80.

² Any change in the aspect or actions of God must, of course, be regarded in its true light in relation to His immutability. See Stone, *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 12–14.

the idea of sacrifice, and see that the true sacrifice is that of the man himself—"Lo, I come to do thy will, O God"—we can understand that this return of filial obedience to the Father, as it has power over us, has power also with God' (pp. 168-9).

So, too, we find Dr. Godet writing :

'Five times do we meet there [*i.e.* in the New Testament] 'the Greek term which signifies the placating, or rendering favourable, of God (Luke xviii. 13 ; Rom. iii. 24 ; Heb. ii. 17 ; 1 John ii. 2 and iv. 10). This, while it does not exactly imply the destruction of a feeling of enmity in God, supposes nevertheless a favourable change to be produced in Him towards the sinner. Paul indeed goes so far as to speak of "indignation," of "wrath" which he attributes to God against those who "obey unrighteousness" (Rom. ii. 8). He further (in Eph. ii. 3) calls all men in their natural condition "children of wrath." According to this there is room for the idea that the term "reconciliation" may apply not only to man, but also to God. . . . The work of reconciliation, then, while, as all Scripture says, having God for its author, has nevertheless, it appears, a certain bearing upon the Divine mind, and the idea of a propitiation which occurs so often in the New Testament, and applying, as it must, to an effect produced upon God, however difficult it may be to accord with the fact that God is at the same time its author, finds yet its right to a place in the Christian dogma. . . . It is true that Paul does not apply the term "reconciliation" to God Himself. He does not say that God has reconciled Himself to the world, but that "God has reconciled the world to Himself through Christ" (2 Cor. v. 18, 19). Did he shrink from employing the first expression as though it might seem to suggest an imputation against the Divine Majesty? However that may be, he himself calls Christ "the means of propitiation set forth by God" (Rom. iii. 25), and in 2 Cor. v. 20, 21 he justifies the invitation to be reconciled to God which the preachers of the Gospel are to address to men by this motive: "For God has made sin for us Him who knew no sin"; in other words: "Be ye reconciled with God, since God Himself has become reconciled to you; since He has done in relation to His own nature what was necessary for that end"' (pp. 333-7).

II. Another confusion of thought frequently found in writings about the Atonement is that, in order to assert that the death of Christ was 'on our behalf,' it is necessary to deny that it was 'in our stead.' This, also, may be noticed in the book before us. And it is here emphasized, as often before, by the inaccurate statement that there is no support in Holy Scripture for the use of the phrase 'in our stead.' The Dean of Canterbury writes:

'Is it an insignificant fact that the word *ἀντί*—which would be required by the theory of vicarious substitution—is *never* used of Christ's death for us, but always *ὑπὲρ* or *πρὸς*, "on our behalf"?' (p. 41.)

‘ἀντὶ, “in the place of,” is not used in the New Testament to support any theory of substitution, but ὑπὲρ and περὶ’ (p. 43).

‘That the word ἀντὶ has no *exceptional* significance’ [in St. Matthew xx. 28] ‘is shown by the fact that, when St. Paul refers to the metaphor, he uses ὑπὲρ (1 Tim. ii. 6)’ (p. 52).

Similarly, Dr. Abbott says :

‘It is not without significance that Paul never says Christ died in the stead of man, but always on behalf of man (never ἀντὶ, but always ὑπὲρ)’ (p. 99).

Mr. Horne speaks less sweepingly, and, indeed, adds some valuable remarks on the meaning of ‘substitution’ and ‘vicarious’; but even he minimizes the facts. Thus, he says :

‘There is the word ἀντὶ, which has but one meaning, “instead of” . . . It is the substitution of one thing for another. It is quite a common word in the New Testament; but there is immense significance in the fact that, with one possible exception, it is never used in passages connected with the doctrine of Atonement. The word meaning “on behalf of” is used; the word meaning “instead of” is not.

‘The one possible exception is a text quoted already : “The Son of man is come to give His life a ransom for many.” The word translated “for” in Matthew and Mark is the word ἀντὶ’ (p. 294).

The actual facts on this point have been set out so often and so clearly that we owe an apology to our readers for stating them again; but, since the assertions of the Dean of Canterbury and Dr. Abbott are altogether misleading, it is necessary that we should do so. ‘The word ἀντὶ,’ says the Dean, ‘is *never* used of Christ’s death for us.’ But in St. Matthew xx. 28 and St. Mark x. 45 it is said ‘The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for (ἀντὶ) many.’ On this passage Dean Alford notes, ‘A plain declaration of the sacrificial and vicarious nature of the death of our Lord,’¹ and Bishop Wordsworth says ‘a ransom in the stead of many,’ ‘a divine assertion of the doctrine of the Atonement.’² The Dean of Canterbury endeavours to escape from this clear refutation of his sweeping statement that ‘ἀντὶ is *never* used of Christ’s death for us’ by the somewhat lame assertion that ‘when St. Paul refers to the metaphor he uses ὑπὲρ.’ Certainly St. Paul uses ὑπὲρ in 1 St. Timothy ii. 6, but—and this both the Dean and Dr. Abbott fail to mention—the noun in that passage is not λύτρον but ἀντίλυτρον: that is, St. Paul expresses the

¹ Alford, *The Greek Testament*, on St. Mat. xx. 28.

² Wordsworth, *The New Testament*, on St. Mat. xx. 28.

sense of 'on behalf of' in the word ὑπὲρ and the sense of 'in the stead of' in the ἀντί- of ἀντίλυτρον. The Bishop of Gloucester well says: 'The ἀντί being here by no means redundant but serving to express the idea of *exchange*'; 'in this important word . . . the idea of a substitution of Christ in our stead *cannot* be ignored, especially when connected with passages of such deep significance as Rom. iii. 25 . . . and Eph. v. 2'; 'all the modern theories of atonement seem to forget that God hates sin *as sin*'; 'here ὑπὲρ . . . seems to point to the benefit conferred by Christ upon us, ἀντί (ἀντίλυτρον) to His substitution of Himself in our place.'¹ Thus, so far from its being true that 'ἀντί is *never* used of Christ's death for us,' ἀντί is certainly so used in the words 'to give His life a ransom for (ἀντί) many'; and, in the very place where St. Paul is saying 'on behalf of (ὑπὲρ) all,' he is careful to show by the noun ἀντίλυτρον that the use of ὑπὲρ does not exclude the sense of ἀντί.

The Dean of Canterbury says, further, with reference to the Mosaic sacrifices:

'Just as ἀντί, "in the place of," is not used in the New Testament to support any theory of substitution, but ὑπὲρ and περὶ, so the Hebrew word for "instead of" (*tachath*) is never used in the Old Testament of the offered victim' (p. 43).

We do not know whether the Dean would allow that the ram in the sacrifice offered by Abraham was a type of our Lord. If it was, his statement should have been made about the Mosaic sacrifices only, and not about the Old Testament as a whole. Even if, on his view, this great act in the history of Abraham had no Messianic significance, it is hardly fair to those of his readers who are unacquainted with Hebrew to give them no warning that what he says will only hold good about the Old Testament generally if the typical significance of the event be rejected. For it is said by the inspired historian 'Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of (*tachath*) his son.'²

The true doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ does not mean that there is no life of holiness which we are bound to live if we can obtain the benefits of His redemption, or that there are no sufferings which we must bear in consequence of our own sins and the sins of others. It does

¹ Ellicott, *The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul*, on 1 St. Tim. ii. 6; cf. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy*, p. 14.

² Gen. xxii. 13, לְעֹלָה תַּחַת בָּנוּ. So also Septuagint, εἰς ὁλοκαύτωσιν ἀντί Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

assert that Christ suffered to save us from eternal pain ; that He bore the punishment of sin to free us from its essential element, the loss of God ; and that in His death on the cross He was in very truth in our place. Of all the mischievous tendencies prevalent among Christians in the present day we do not know that there is any more hurtful than that which in the name of the love of God is emptying the supreme manifestation of divine mercy of its true meaning. Too many teachers, it has been said with great force

'have practically reduced the efficacy of our Redeemer's death to the subjective effect of a supreme effort of sympathy, whereby one Himself sinless could profoundly feel for the misery of sinners, could grieve over and repudiate their sin, and win them back to repentance and peace by the impressiveness of an unparalleled self-devotion. But this would keep Him still "at a distance" from us ; He would not have "borne our sins," He would only have sadly pointed to them : He would not have entered into that "relation to God" in which they had "involved" us,¹—He would only have persuaded us to cancel it, to make our own "atonement" by simply cancelling them. And how could such a theory account for the language of Scripture, with its manifold abundance of images and statements, all tending to form one idea,—the idea of an actual barrier established by sin between man and the free outflow of Divine mercy, and removed by the intrinsic virtue of a Divine act,—the acceptance of death by the Incarnate Son of God, in accordance with that *φιλανθρωπία* of the Father, which was shown in giving Him "to be a propitiation for our sins" ? For He who was thus given, who thus gave Himself, had been God from all eternity, from, and in, and with the Father. His Godhead could impart a Divine efficacy to all that He did or suffered in His manhood, and a Divine significance to that headship over our race, which made Him its sole competent representative. But, in so representing us, He could, in the fullest sense, stand for us. By submitting to a passion which was spiritual as well as physical, which included the agony of the sin-bearer and the tremendous experiences of the forsaken, He, the Man who ceased not to be God, upheld, with unique transcendent emphasis, the eternal law of righteousness against sin ; "the principle that we, sinners, deserved to suffer, being asserted in His sufferings, that it might not have to be asserted in ours."² In this sense, He "gave Himself a ransom for many," and our sins were in effect laid upon Him ; He could take them away on our behalf, because, as the Lamb of God, He had borne their burden, had endured the chastisement of our peace. "Vicarious,"—"substitution,"—"satisfaction,"—we must not give up the use of these terms in a sense which is neither immoral nor arbitrary, but consonant to our Saviour's office as Second Adam, and involved in the very perfection of His own

¹ Referring to Dale, *The Atonement*, p. 424.

² Quoted from Dale, *The Atonement*, p. 433.

miraculous love ; and thus we may take with us to the throne of grace that plea which St. Anselm recommends to Christian penitents, "My God, I interpose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between my sins and Thy displeasure."''¹

In writing on the points with which we have so far dealt, we have made many quotations. We have done so, and in particular have quoted the last admirable passage by Dr. Bright, because it seems to us that some of the writers in the book before us are without excuse for the blunders and confusions which they make. We could understand that, if the only presentation of the wrath of God, or the reconciliation of the Father by the death of the Son, or the sufferings of our Lord as being in our stead, or the substitution in the Atonement made on the cross, which had been known to a writer had been that of the Calvinistic theology, he might be pardoned if, in a revolt from that unscriptural system, he came to reject also what we believe to be valuable truth. It is always necessary to make allowance for reaction and to be gentle towards that repulsion from the truth which is the result of fragments of what is true being distorted into what is false. But, in the case of the Atonement, so much has been said and written to assert the objective character of the reconciliation made on our behalf by a sacrificial satisfaction in our stead, which has been based on the love of the Father giving His only-begotten Son no less than the love of the Son in accepting the cup which the Father appointed, that we cannot see that excuses may be rightly made for such confusions of thought as those on which we have been commenting. It ought to have been clear long ago to those who take on themselves to write on the doctrine of the Atonement that the Catholic theologians who declare the reality of the wrath of God against human sin assert no less clearly His love for sinners ; that the reconciliation of the Father which is a necessity because of His holiness if forgiveness is to be won is desired and planned by the Father Himself no less than by the Son ; that the substitution and vicarious satisfaction which are made on our behalf and in our stead in the death of God the Son do not mean that we are under no law of discipline or that we have no share in the acts of Him with whom, by the very means whereby we accept and use the redemption He has accomplished for us, we have the closest sacramental union.

¹ Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, pp. 329-331 ; cf. Stone, *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, pp. 87-98. See also *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1895, pp. 378-395.

III. It should not have been possible for the Dean of Canterbury to quote a famous sentence from St. Bernard without giving those of his readers who have no knowledge of St. Bernard's own words the opportunity of seeing its true meaning. The Dean quotes (p. 48) the fragment, 'It was not the death, but the will of Him who freely died, which was pleasing.' As so quoted, it might easily be taken as a proof that St. Bernard did not associate our Lord's atoning work specifically with His death; and, indeed, unless this were the meaning, it is difficult to see why it should be quoted in the passage in which the Dean uses it. Those who are acquainted with the words of St. Bernard know that he connected in the closest possible way the death of Christ and the accomplishment of the Atonement. This is made clear even by the very sentence of which the Dean quotes the opening words. It is confirmed by the context in which the sentence stands. As the point is of importance, and as we fear the few words which the Dean gives are often quoted in the same misleading way as that in which he quotes them and are frequently therefore misunderstood, we will venture to give at some length the passage in question. Replying to Abelard, who had at any rate minimized the objective value of the death of Christ, St. Bernard wrote:

'But if it is not lawful to peer into the mystery of the will of God, it is, nevertheless, lawful to perceive the effect of the work, to realise the fruit of the benefit. And it is not lawful to be silent about that which it is lawful to know, because it is the glory of kings to conceal a word and the glory of God to search out a saying. Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptance that when we were still sinners we were reconciled to God by the means of the death of His Son. Where is reconciliation, there also is remission of sins. For if, as Scripture says, our sins make a separation between ourselves and God, there is no reconciliation while sin remains. Wherein, then, is the remission of sins? This cup, says Scripture, of the new covenant in my blood, which will be shed for you for the remission of sins. Therefore, where is reconciliation, there is remission of sins. And what is that but justification? Whether, then, it is reconciliation, or remission of sins, or justification, whether, also, it is redemption, or deliverance from the chains of the devil by whom we were held captive at his will—by the interposition of the death of the Only-begotten we obtain it, being justified freely in His blood, in whom, as Scripture says again, we have redemption by means of His blood, and remission of sins according to the riches of His grace. Why, you ask, does He accomplish by means of blood that which He could accomplish by means of His words? Inquire of Himself. It is allowed me to know that it is so: it is not allowed me to know why it is so. Does the thing formed say to Him who formed it, Why

hast Thou made me thus? But to Abelard this seems to be folly. He cannot restrain his laughter. Hear his jeers. "How," he asks "does the Apostle say that we are justified and reconciled to God by means of the death of His Son when God ought to have been so much the more angry with man as men sinned more in crucifying His Son than in transgressing His first command by tasting one single fruit?" As if it were not possible in one and the same deed for the sin of the wicked to displease God and the goodness of the suffering One to please Him. Abelard asks again, "If the sin of Adam was so great that it could not be expiated except by the death of Christ, what expiation shall that murder itself have which was committed in the case of Christ?" Shortly we answer that the expiation is the very blood which they shed, and the interposition of Him whom they slew. He has a further question, "Was the death of the innocent Son so pleasing to God the Father that by means of it He was reconciled to us who by sinning had done that because of which the innocent Lord was slain; and could He not forgive the much lighter sin unless this greatest of sins was committed?" What was pleasing was not the death but the will of Him who freely died and by that death abolished death, accomplished salvation, restored innocence, triumphed over principalities and powers, spoiled hell, enriched heaven, made peace between the things in heaven and the things in earth, renewed all things. And since this so precious death, to be voluntarily undertaken as a remedy against sin, yet could not take place except by means of sin, He did not indeed choose but He made a good use of the wickedness of the impious and condemned death through death and sin through sin. And the greater the wickedness of those who killed Him, the more holy was His will and the more powerful for salvation, in so far as, by the work of so great power, that ancient sin, great as it was, yielded to this which was committed in the case of Christ, as less to greater. Nor is this victory ascribed to the sin or to the sinners, but to Him who used sin well and bravely endured sinners and converted to the use of goodness whatever the cruelty of the wicked dared against Him. But that blood which was shed was so copious for forgiveness that it blotted out also that greatest sin of all by which it came to pass that it was shed, and in this way left no doubt at all as to the blotting out of that ancient sin since it was lighter. Again Abelard asks, "To whom does it not seem cruel and unjust that one should need the blood of the innocent for any payment, or that it could in any way be pleasing to Him for the innocent to be slain, let alone that God so welcomed the death of His Son that by means of it He was reconciled to the whole world?" God the Father did not need the blood of the Son, but yet He accepted it when it was offered; not thirsting for the blood but for salvation, for salvation was in the blood. Salvation assuredly, and not, as Abelard fancies and writes, merely the exhibition of love.¹

It is fair enough to quote St. Bernard as saying 'What

¹ St. Bernard, *Tract. de Error. Abelardi*, 20-22.

was pleasing was not the death but the will of Him who freely died,' provided that the further words of which the passage is full, closely associating forgiveness and salvation with the blood which was shed in the death of Christ, are also quoted. The Dean of Canterbury is careful to quote the one short phrase. He is silent about all else which the passage contains, and forbears to state that its central teaching is to emphasize to the greatest possible extent the truth he attempts to minimize.

IV. The essay by Mr. Campbell has the value that it calls attention to the persistence of the idea of the Atonement in Christian thought, and it contains a useful statement on the 'content of the sense of guilt.' This includes, it is said, the feeling that the 'soul is under condemnation,' the fact that 'every sinner feels himself to be permanently associated with his own evil deeds,' that 'the chief penalty of sin is inhibition from good,' and 'man's inability to atone for his sin' (pp. 19-22). It is much to be regretted that he has added to his essay an 'acceptance of the hypothesis that the origin of moral evil is in God,' so that 'the Christian doctrine of the Person of Christ' shows that our Lord is 'associated with the existence of the primordial evil which has its origin in God' (pp. 24-5). He does not develop at any length his strange theory. What he does say is difficult to reconcile with the orthodox doctrine of the holiness of God.

V. The essay by Dr. Harnack fails to recognise a principal part of the doctrine of the Atonement. He asserts indeed that our Lord is the reconciler and the indweller. He shows how the simplest form of the Christian religion includes the obligation and the gift of power to live a holy life. He notices that man cannot do without redemption and a Redeemer, and that redemption can come only from God. He allows that our Lord 'was entitled to call Himself' 'the Son of God' (p. 120). But we do not find any explicit assertion of the keystone of the whole doctrine of the Atonement, the fact that our Lord is Himself personally God. 'To Christians,' wrote Dr. Liddon,

'who confess the true Godhead of Christ, the Apostolic teaching respecting His death must seem to lie far within the range of its possible consequences. The Apostles teach that mankind are slaves, and that Christ on the cross furnishes their ransom. Christ crucified is voluntarily devoted and accursed. He is paying the penalty which sin inevitably merits. He is washing human nature in the stream of His own blood. He is reconciling man to a holy,

loving,
ates
head.

Al
thoug

V.

review

death

His d

it is th

value

which

statem

'W

to be n

previou

Dr

'Th

reform

Christ.

the est

and ca

or righ

law and

may als

indeed,

death o

'Ch

secure

than co

Dr

'Th

referenc

referenc

sin), an

Dr

'Th

heart of

is the e

what to

the true

'H

¹ Lie

Series, I

loving, but offended God. The truth which underlies and illuminates the Apostolical language is the truth of our Saviour's God-head.¹

Able, then, as Dr. Harnack's essay is, and much valuable thought as it expresses, we cannot regard it as satisfactory.

VI. Thanks are due to those writers in the volume under review who have laid stress on that aspect of our Lord's death by which it is seen to be a satisfaction for human sin. His death is not, indeed, to be separated from His life. But it is the central act in the great sacrifice, and its expiatory value must be maintained. We may not agree with all which Mr. Adeney says, but we are glad to see his clear statement :

'What is called the *subjective* effect of the Atonement is found to be most pronounced just in proportion as there is faith in its previous *objective* efficacy' (p. 150).

Dr. Marcus Dods writes :

'The two great ends of punishment, the homage to law and the reformation of the lawbreaker, are thus alike secured by the death of Christ. The radical idea and essential element in punishment is the establishment of law, the impression conveyed that law is law and cannot with impunity be broken. It is on the stability of law or right that human happiness depends. Dismiss the sanctity of law and you cut human hope down at the root. But punishment may also reform the criminal. Rarely does it accomplish this end indeed, but it may legitimately be hoped for and aimed at. The death of Christ secures both ends in the highest degree' (pp. 186-7).

'Christ's substitution is justified by the fact that He was able to secure that greater moral results would from it accrue to the race than could be reached by punishment of the sinner' (p. 192).

Dr. Cave writes :

'The death of Jesus was a *satisfaction* (satisfaction having reference to the claims of law), and a *reconciliation* (which has reference to estrangement), and an *expiation* (which has reference to sin), and a *propitiation* (which has reference to wrath)' (p. 256).

Dr. Godet writes :

'This cry of anguish, of immense sorrow, which broke from the heart of Jesus into the ear of God, brought appeasement ; for that is the exact sense of the word which the Scripture uses to designate what took place in the heart of God. Here was the reparation, the true expiation in the Christian sense of the word' (p. 343).

'He who aspires to salvation must associate himself by faith in

¹ Liddon, *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*. First Series, p. 236.

that travail of soul accomplished in the heart of Christ when He consented to be "made sin for us," he must look upon his sin with the same sense of reprobation; unite himself with the sorrowing confession of Jesus, with His humble appeal to the Divine mercy when, before His Father, He judged sin as God judges it, and pronounced its sentence of death as God Himself pronounces it' (p. 347).

'The work of deliverance which Jesus wrought by the offering up of Himself did not end with the death of the cross. As the Risen and Glorified One He continues it in the heavenly life by His work of intercession before God, as say St. Paul (Rom. viii. 34) and John (1 John ii. 1), and as is vividly set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. vii. 25), "who ever liveth to make intercession for us." The work of expiation accomplished here below was the point of departure for this heavenly intercession which is its simple continuation' (pp. 348-9).

VII. The doctrine of the Atonement cannot be properly realised and understood except as it is viewed in connexion with the rest of the Christian system. Of this fact there is some recognition in the passage which we have quoted last from the essay by Dr. Godet, where it is pointed out that the work of our Lord on the cross must not be separated from that in His ascended life. We have already alluded to the necessity of holding the truth of the Incarnation if we are to grasp the meaning of the Atonement. It is needful to observe, also, that we are not in a position to consider the doctrine of the Atonement rightly unless we are mindful of the doctrines of the Church and the Sacraments. 'Jesus our Lord' 'was delivered up for the sake of our trespasses, and was raised for the sake of our justification.'¹ 'If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life.'² The human life which possessed sacrificial efficacy by having passed through death, and divine power because it is the life of God the Son, is pleaded in heaven on our behalf. The 'remembrance of the sacrifice of His death'³ is made not only to ourselves but also before the Father when in the Holy Eucharist the bread and wine are consecrated, so that 'the inward part' is 'the Body and Blood of Christ,'⁴ and we are thereby enabled to plead on earth that same offering which our Lord is pleading in heaven. In Holy Baptism there is 'the inward and spiritual grace' of 'a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness,' so that the baptized who have been

¹ Rom. iv. 24-25.

² Rom. v. 10.

³ Second Exhortation in the Order of Holy Communion.

⁴ Catechism.

'by r
mad
our
of C
in us
able
bloo
body
bloo
of th
ignor
plish
who
we h
V
above
of the
more
Scrip
Chur
clear
to bri
any p
of rev
may
of its
to it.
seek
teach
From
not s
with r
cerne
Atone
plainl
For th
the ed
of Go
punish
victim

¹ Ca

² M

³ T

⁴ P

Comm

'by nature born in wrath and the children of wrath' 'are hereby made the children of grace,'¹ being 'partakers of the death of' our Lord.² In Holy Communion 'we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood'; 'we dwell in Christ and Christ in us'; we are one with Christ and Christ with us'³; we are able 'so to eat the flesh of' 'Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood.'⁴ These solemn facts shed a light on the doctrine of the Atonement which it cannot have when they are ignored. It is therefore a matter for regret that the accomplished writers of these various essays do not include anyone who allows their due place to the truths, expressions of which we have quoted from the Book of Common Prayer.

VIII. *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought* purports, above all things, to meet what is needed by the circumstances of the present day. For our own part, we might have been more attracted by a volume on the Atonement in Holy Scripture, or the Atonement in the teaching of the Christian Church. As an apologetic power, we have more belief in the clear and accurate statement of revealed truth than in attempts to bring it into harmony with what people are thinking at any particular time. Yet it is important that those aspects of revealed truth which the thought of any particular time may specially need, either because of its strength or because of its weakness, should be well and adequately presented to it. And when difficulties of any kind are felt by honest seekers after truth, it is part of the office of the Christian teacher to do his best to help in the solution of them. From this point of view the book we have been reviewing does not seem to us to afford any considerable amount of help with regard to what, so far as our own experience is concerned, we have found to be the chief difficulty about the Atonement among educated and cultivated men. To speak plainly, a good deal of it seems to us to be 'behind the times.' For the chief difficulty which we ourselves have found among the educated and cultivated is not that of there being wrath of God against sin, or of God being reconciled, or of the punishment of a guilty race being laid upon an innocent victim, but the general idea itself of Atonement through

¹ Catechism.

² Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants.

³ Third Exhortation in the Order of Holy Communion.

⁴ Prayer before the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of Holy Communion.

sacrifice. To meet this difficulty, the great need is, it seems to us, that of laying stress on very deep truths. The awful holiness of God, the enormity of sin, the power of sacrifice as it may be seen in many forms of human suffering, the strength of giving as it is indicated even in the eternal life of the Holy Trinity, the indissoluble union of our Lord with the Father by reason of His deity and His indissoluble union with human nature by reason of His manhood, the truth that the Church is His mystical body, the reality of the Sacraments—these are subjects which, in our judgment, ought to have a very prominent place in any treatment of the Atonement which is to be really helpful to thinking men at the present time. It is, we believe, as these deep truths are thoroughly considered, that the meaning of the Atonement can be grasped and appreciated. Moreover, we should ourselves be disposed to lay great stress on the general tendency in human thought to attach value to sacrifice. God 'left not Himself without witness,' even when He 'suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways.'¹ 'The things that are made' were even to the heathen world a manifestation of 'the invisible things' of God.² The image of God in which man was created was not destroyed, but only corrupted and distorted, by the effects of the Fall. In his sinful state he still had, in however impaired a condition, the reason and conscience with which God had created him. Apart from the revelation to the Jewish people, it was possible that men 'should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him.'³ In sacrifices of differing kinds, the heathen sought means of propitiation for sin and of communion with God. The sacrifices in some cases took terrible forms, for they were devised by men in the darkness and malignity of sin, 'strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world.'⁴ Yet they had the witness outside themselves in God's creation, and the image of God not altogether blotted out within them. Their ideas were distorted, as the image was marred; there was in them a germ of truth, as the image really remained. In the revelation made to the Jews sacrifices were appointed and given high value by the direct act of God. For an age which studies 'folk-lore,' it is worth while to work out the significance of the fact that the sacrifice of Calvary, the way of which was prepared by the ordinances of the Jewish religion, has in it a principle the recognition of

¹ Acts xiv. 16-17.² Acts xvii. 27.³ Rom. i. 20.⁴ Eph. ii. 12.

whi
thor

som
mad
allu
they
the
write

'
direc
man
"wise
Roma
Anglic
of fait
ceived
produ
not Cl

M
gions
'ancie
that
proph
and t
'pard
tomed
should
'propit
whe
of Rel
doctrin
for 'a g
innocen
-64).

'Th
emphasi
of the at
of sacrific
about the

And

'Chr
If it be sa
to be inte
VOL.

which, in however distorted a form, has been found in human thought all over the world.

The facts we have in view have not been forgotten by some of the writers of these essays. But the use which is made of them in almost all the instances in which they are alluded to is, in our judgment, fundamentally wrong. For they are employed as a means of rejecting, not of justifying, the Christian doctrine of the Atonement. Thus Dr. Abbott writes :

'No theory of the Atonement can be correct which implies, directly or indirectly, that it is offered by man or on behalf of man to God. Whether the sacrifice be a hecatomb offered by "wise Ulysses," or a bloodless sacrifice of the Mass offered by a Roman Catholic priest, or an imitation of such Mass offered by an Anglican Catholic priest, or a demand that the worshipper by an act of faith make the sacrifice of Christ his own—if the sacrifice is conceived as offered by or on behalf of man to God, and its object to produce an effect on the mind and heart of God—it is so far pagan, not Christian' (pp. 98-9).

Mr. Snell contends that the 'sacrificialism' of the 'religions of the old world,' including that of the Jews, was an 'ancient error' which our Lord 'extinguished.' He imagines that the 'sacrificial system' itself was opposed by the prophets among the Jews, and that the 'priests' were 'wrong' and the 'prophets' were 'right' (pp. 259-60). It was 'pardonable,' he thinks, in 'the early Christians,' 'accustomed' as they were 'to the sacrificial system,' that they should make the mistake of framing the theory of the 'propitiatory sacrifice' of Christ (pp. 261-62); but that theory, whether as stated by Luther or as stated in the Second Article of Religion of the Church of England, is an 'appalling doctrine' which 'we dare not admit' 'into our moral nature,' for 'a god whose anger must be appeased by the blood of the innocent is a god whom to worship were infamous' (pp. 262-64). Somewhat similarly, Dr. Hunter says :

'The tendency of religion in its cruder forms has ever been to emphasize and magnify the distance between God and man, and out of the attempt to reduce that separation have come the gross ideas of sacrifice which, passing over into Christian thought, have gathered about the cross and put it to an open shame' (p. 308).

And Dr. Munger writes :

'Christ was in the line of the prophets, and not of the priests. If it be said that He is our Priest as well as our Prophet, the Priest is to be interpreted by the Prophet. No priest appeared on the Mount

of Transfiguration. He asserted that His death was the fulfilment of "the Scriptures of the prophets," not of the priests, though the Old Testament was full of sacrificial ritual. The ancient antagonism did not die out, but lived on in Him because the prophet had superseded the priest; the life takes the place of the sacrifice; the man himself becomes the altar and the offering. Thus, by the very place in which Christ put Himself, He shut off those theories of the Atonement that wear the priestly cast. But, in spite of His own definition of His work, it was early transferred to the other camp and became priestly in form and spirit. Christ is made an oblation and His blood atones. This interpretation puts Him where He refused to stand' (pp. 360-1).

A different view is expressed by Mr. Horne. 'It is worth while,' he says,

'to take clear note that alike in heathenism and paganism men have groped their way to a position which has promise of the highest in it—that for a man to make his peace with God he must be prepared to offer God his best. He must be willing to make any and every sacrifice. . . . Here is the root idea of propitiation through acts of atonement; a people making its peace with God—or, more accurately, seeking to make God at peace with it—through the sacrifice of what is highest and dearest. That is what we mean when we say that acts of atonement belong to the religious history of man' (pp. 276-7).

It is this latter line of thought that we should like to have seen worked out at length. A real service would have been done by a book on this subject if, in the first place, it had been shown that the idea itself of sacrificial atonement answers to what history exhibits as a very strong sense in the mind of man, and if, in the second place, the sacrificial character of the Atonement had been carefully stated as it stands in Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Church, and in relation to the other doctrines which make up Christian belief. In reviewing *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought* it is melancholy to think that seventeen writers, some of them eminent and able men, should have produced a work which, taken as a whole, is of so little helpfulness, either as a statement of doctrine or as a means of meeting the difficulties of the thought of our day.

To the
sible to
of view
down a
ness as
devotio

ART. XI.—THE PASSION PLAY: A STUDY AND AN APPRECIATION.

1. *Ober Ammergau and its Passion Play.* A Retrospect of the History of Ober Ammergau and its Passion Play from the Commencement up to the Present Day. Also full Description of the Country and the Manners and Customs of the People. Text by HERMINE DIEMER *née* VON HILLERN. Translation by WALTER S. MANNING. Illustrations from Drawings by Zeno Diemer and Fritz Tersch, and from Photographs by Leo Schweyer, Stuttgart (official publication of 1900), K. Christa, M. Dietrich, &c. 4to. (Munich and Ober Ammergau, 1900.)
2. *Offizieller Gesamt-Text des Oberammergauer Passionspieles.* Zum ersten Male nach dem Manuscripte des H. H. GEISTL. RATES J. A. DAISENBERGER im Druck veröffentlicht. Einzige von der Gemeindeverwaltung Oberammergau offiziell genemigte Ausgabe des Gesamttextes. 3. Auflage, 1900. Oberammergau. München.
3. *The Passion Play at Ober Ammergau.* Translated into English, and the Songs of the Chorus in German and English. By MARIA TRENCH. (London, 1900.)
4. *The Passion Play of Ober Ammergau: The Great Atonement at Golgotha.* The complete Text, translated for the first time from the German in 1881, by MARY FRANCES DREW. With the addition of the Choruses in Rhyme and Rhythm, in accordance with the Original, as sung in 1890. (London, 1900.)
5. *The Passion Play at Ober Ammergau, 1900.* The full German Text of the Play, with English Translation, printed side by side, copiously illustrated with a complete series of the photographs of 1890. By W. T. STEAD. (London, 1900.)
6. *An Art-student in Munich.* By Mrs. HOWITT WATTS. In Two Vols. Second Edition. (London, 1880.) (Original edition, 1853.)

To the devout spectator of the Passion Play it seems impossible to regard it at the moment from any but a single point of view. Its overwhelming devotional solemnity crushes down all thought of mere criticism. Its glorious completeness as a spectacle contributes immensely, no doubt, to the devotional help which it affords—in this way, at least, if in

no other, that a single failure in the arrangements, or one serious flaw in taste, would mar the solemnity of the whole. Yet to allow oneself to think of the spectacle seems almost a sacrilege at the moment. It is after the representation, perhaps after leaving the village, that the thought presents itself, for instance, how wondrous were the schemes of colour which the stage was continually presenting, how absolutely perfect the timing with which each sequence took place, how certain and how effortless the perfection with which, at the most tragic of moments, some detail was perfectly carried through, a fault or a hesitation in which would have been remembered as an outrage upon the heart.

Or, again, its completeness as a drama, the masterly exhibition of motives, as the traders, the priests, the betrayer converge, each one on his own lines, towards the consummation of the plot—all this, when looked back to and thought out, must raise the humble *Pfarrer* very high among the dramatists of the world. But a part of its masterly completeness is the fact that while the play goes on, the 'inevitableness' of every stage and the tragic completeness of the whole do but serve to carry out for the spectator the aim which the writer set before him, 'the edification of the Christian world.'¹

Yet there are many aspects of the play which deserve to be recalled and drawn out, both for their bearing upon its central intention and for that actual noteworthiness of their own upon which it is so impossible—so undesirable—to dwell during the representation. This is why, after all that has been written, in more ephemeral forms and for more immediate purposes of edification, we think it well that the *Church Quarterly Review* should put something on record about them. The single central intention should never be lost sight of for a moment in anything that is written upon the subject. The Gospels are still the Gospels, to be handled with the tenderest reverence, when manuscripts and readings and evidences are the immediate theme of a writer. And the visible embodiment of their story upon the stage of the Ammergau Theatre must be treated, from whatever point of view, as above all things a setting forth of Christ crucified. But with this reserve of intention, pervading, as we trust, every line, it is our desire to set before the reader those other aspects of the play, so unimportant compared with the one, and yet so remarkable in themselves, and with so close a bearing upon edification.

¹ Daisenberger, 'as quoted on p. x of *The Passion Play at Ober Ammergau*.

our
tion
men
high
thro
for n
V
of t
body
whic
fully
actor

I
cann
inter
ice-b
lies
natin
muni
embo
clay-
the g
unde
folk.

A
a still
world
sical
great
more
done
Choru
seeme
drama
geisten
no do
this ca
Christ
subjec
person
of the
the au

¹ Th
the hea

We have to deal with it simply as a drama, as bringing out into proper relief the motives, the characters, the situations which brought about, on the human side, the development of a unique catastrophe; which, regarded from the highest point of view, carried out into actual execution, through the agency of human passions, the purpose of God for mankind.

We must dwell upon the development at Ober Ammergau of that delicate instinct for the drama, that power of embodying character, which pervades the community so evenly, which sustains itself from decade to decade with so wonderfully little variation, and which comes out, in the leading actors, into such striking and impressive individuality.

Regarded as a study in sociology—the word exists, and cannot be dispensed with—this ‘survival’ is profoundly interesting. On the surface of the Europe of to-day, like an ice-borne boulder on the Jura, this fragment of mediæval life lies before us for comparison or contrast, astonishing, fascinating, unique, to be studied in flesh and blood instead of in muniments and charters, a piece of documentary evidence embodied in the life of a community instead of in a tablet of clay—the spirit that reared the cathedrals, and that produced the great schools of painting, presenting itself for sympathetic understanding in the quiet, recollected faces of simple village folk.

And the play, in more than one aspect, takes us back to a still earlier epoch in the intellectual development of the world; it serves as a living comment on the ancient classical drama. The fatefulness and the ‘irony’ alike of the great Greek tragic stage came home to the present writer more keenly at Ober Ammergau in August than they had done at Bradfield in June. And, again, the function of the Chorus, as intermediary between the action and the audience, seemed something more real in itself, more pertinent to the drama on the stage, as presented by the Ammergau *Schutzgeist*¹ than by the Argive Elders themselves. This was due, no doubt, in a great measure to the fact that the interest in this case has that personal, that spiritual reality which every Christian must feel when the redemption of the world is the subject. But there the fact remains that, by reason of this personal element, unavoidably absent as it is in the revival of the classical drama, one learns what the Chorus meant to the audience in the theatre at Athens; and that to a higher

¹ The members of the Chorus represent guardian angels appealing to the hearts of the audience.

degree than when one sees the very plays which they witnessed and hears the very words to which they listened.

It is our intention to treat of the Passion Play from all these points of view. May all be subordinated in harmony to its one devotional end in a way which may save them at least from jarring on the Christian sensibilities of any who follow them out!

But before we pursue these lines of thought, we must notice some of the books about the play. Foremost among these must be placed the noble volume which we have placed at the head of this article, a fine quarto of 252 pages, measuring twelve inches by nine, and teeming throughout with the most exquisite illustrations of the places, scenes, and persons. The work was undertaken in the winter of 1899 by Madame Hermine Diemer at the request of a publishing firm at Munich, and it seems incredible that the text and the copious illustrations can have been completed in so short a time; for the writer very justly speaks of it as 'unique both in artistic finish and in wealth of subject matter.'

'When I commenced the work,' she goes on to say, 'I had no idea what a rich store of treasure my Ammergau investigations would open up. I may safely say that I found more than I sought for. I have not only endeavoured to do justice to the modern part of the subject, but also first and foremost to investigate the historical sources from which the character of this remarkable people is derived. I have striven to throw a light upon Ammergau and its sacred Play from all possible points. As to whether I have succeeded is for the reader to decide' (Preface).

No one, we think, can hesitate to accord the most ungrudging praise to this magnificent work. To show how wide is the ground it covers we cannot do better than copy out the list of contents under the following headings: I. 'A Modern Pilgrimage,' *scilicet* from Munich onwards to Ammergau (pp. 1-28). II. 'The Village of the Passion Play and its Environs' (pp. 29-44). III. 'History of the Village of Ober Ammergau' (pp. 45-86). IV. 'The Evolution of the Passion Play and Text' (pp. 87-128). V. 'Three Heroes of the Passion Play' (pp. 129-149). This gives biographical sketches of the great and good men, Othreas Weiss, Rochus Dedler, and the holy Daisenberger, who each in turn brought the Passion Play to its present perfection. VI. 'The Music of the Passion Play' (pp. 150-154). VII. 'Passion Play Actors of the Past' (pp. 155-170), among whom we find Johann and his brother Joseph Diemer, the latter the father-in-law of the author of the book, and so on to Joseph Mayr, the

'Ch
Pas
To-
By
the
peri
one
char
(pp.
give
feeb
gau
We
Chan
at O
quali
alwa
vehic
to th
tions
ducti
Chan
may
versio
arran
editio
any o
M
and w
that,
hopel
serve
As Ju
betray
which
Priests
Ende
the me
ceed i
to an
other
'When
and I
altoget

'Christus' of 1871, 1880, and 1890. VIII. 'Veterans of the Passion Play' (pp. 171-190). IX. 'Ober Ammergau of To-Day' (pp. 191-206). X. 'The Passion' (pp. 207-252). By the 'Passion' is not only meant the Play as such, it is the whole summer during which it is played. The whole period is known as the 'Passion' (p. 207). This section is one of the greatest interest and abounds with the most charming illustrations. XI. 'Pictures of the Passion Play' (pp. 253-269).

Our readers will have gathered from the descriptions here given that this *magnum opus* completely dwarfs all other feeble efforts to do justice to the great theme of the Ammergau Passion Play. Like Aaron's rod it swallows up the rest. We gladly welcome the reissue—no longer by the 'author of *Charles Lowder*,' but by 'Maria Trench'—of the *Passion Play at Ober Ammergau*. For this little book we have all but unqualified praise. The English is never bald, the renderings are always faithful. The adoption of a rhythmical prose as the vehicle for the songs of the Chorus is preferable in every way to the jingling, halty rhyme to be found in inferior productions. The perfect taste and the graceful tone of the introduction are all that could be expected from 'the author of *Charles Lowder*.' We can only hope that ten years hence it may be possible for visitors to Ober Ammergau to have her version in their hands, with its excellent typography and arrangement, and—side by side with the English—a complete edition of the German text, which can now be procured without any of the difficulties which Miss Trench met with in 1880.

Miss Drew's is a reverent and well-meaning little book, and we are very sorry to have nothing to say of it except that, as English, it is bald, and that, as a rendering, it is hopelessly inaccurate. Of the inaccuracy let the following serve as specimens. They are taken from a single scene. As Judas soliloquizes over his prospects, after promising to betray his Master, and thinks that his position is certain whichever side may win, he says, 'Gelingt es dann der Priesterschaft den Meister gefangen zu setzen, und geht es zu Ende mit ihm, so hab' ich mein Scherflein in Trocknen': the meaning of which of course is, 'Should the priests succeed in taking the Master prisoner, and matters come to an end with Him—then I have my mite secure'—the other alternative having to follow. Miss Drew renders it 'When the priests have succeeded in putting Him in prison and I shall have secured my own interests'—missing altogether the fact that there is an alternative to follow;

though this is what the entire soliloquy turns upon, that he thinks he is safe either way. When he comes to put the other alternative, he says that in case his Master prove victorious, he can return to him in penitence and be forgiven, and that in such a case 'ich kann mir dann das Verdienst zuschreiben, dass ich die Sache zur Entscheidung gebracht'—'I can take credit to myself for the service of having forced matters to a decision.' In other words, though Daisenberger himself does not make his Judas what certain unworthy rehabilitators (such as De Quincy and Whately) have tried to make 'the son of perdition,' viz. a faithful disciple using means to force his Master to declare Himself, he does make this float across his mind as something for which he may get credit if things should turn out that way. Miss Drew misses the point so completely as to render it, 'and yet I should have the reward I am resolved to earn.' Could anything be farther from either the letter or the spirit of the original?

Mr. Stead's translation is fairly accurate, though his metrical renderings of the songs—done for him by a Miss Werner—are bald and jingling to a degree.

His English version is better for study beforehand than for following during the play; for instead of simply giving the dialogue, and leaving the action to be followed, it takes the form of a narrative—not always conceived in the best taste—introducing the words for the characters as part of a continuous whole. This, with its small type, makes it a trying and inconvenient book to use while the play is going on.

Still, as far as the text is concerned, the English world must, we suppose, be grateful to Mr. Stead; for his is the only book which gives the German and English side by side. But was there no proof-reader in London to save Mr. Stead from the atrocious misprints with which the German abounds?

What are we to say of the Introduction? It is well meant, in a gushing, sentimental fashion. But the taste of it! Perhaps it 'hits' a certain level, appeals to a certain class. But to read it is to know what it would be to be 'personally conducted' to Ober Ammergau with a party of half-educated tourists, who wished to express themselves not irreverently, and hardly knew how to go about it.

And one expression keeps recurring and recurring about which we do not know what to think—is it meant to convey a suggestion that, after all, the interest of Calvary was only that of a martyrdom, differing in degree, not in kind, from the sufferings of other good men? Or is it pure ignorance of

theology, with a Philistinish misapprehension of all that the Ammergauers intend, which makes him say to his readers that 'that is the great gain of the Passion Play. It takes us clear back across the ages to the standpoint of those who saw Jesus the Galilean was [*sic*] but a man among men. It compels us to see him without the aureole of Divinity, as he appeared to those who knew him from his boyhood, and who said, "Are not his brethren still with us?"' And again, 'from the standpoint which the actors on the stage assumed yesterday, what was the Passion?' implying, apparently, that to the actors themselves the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ presents itself from an Ebionite point of view. Now if there is one thing that the Ammergauers do not intend to convey, one thing which they studiously show that they would consider it blasphemy to convey to us; it is that—but we prefer not to repeat the words.

We are most anxious to be just to Mr. Stead, but we cannot help saying that he sadly mistook his vocation when he attempted to deal with the Passion Play. Whatever his own beliefs may be (and into these it is no business of ours to inquire), of this we cannot acquit him—that if he holds the Christian faith he has handled it with the presumption of gross ignorance. The results of such handling on the uneducated, to whom alone he can appeal, can only be to lead them to believe that the most obvious gain from the Passion Play is that it strips the legendary Christ of a divinity whose ascription to His Person has served no other purpose than to obscure the completeness of His humanity.

The book called *The Art Student in Munich* has been placed with others at the head of this article, because, though it contains but two chapters on Ober Ammergau, it was, as we are told in the Preface, the first thing published in England which attracted attention to the Passion Play. The preface to the first edition is dated 1853. It was not till 1860 that Dean Stanley's account in *Macmillan's Magazine* for Oct. and Nov. 1860, entitled 'The Ammergau Mystery or Sacred Drama of 1860,' did so much to bring it before the English.

Anna Mary Howitt, writing almost fifty years ago, says:

'We had come expecting to feel our souls revolt against at so material a representation of Christ as any representation of Him, we naturally imagined, must be in a peasants' miracle play. Yet so far, up to the end of the Gethsemane scene, 'strange to confess, neither horror, disgust, nor contempt was excited in our minds. Such an earnest solemnity and simplicity breathed throughout the whole of

the performance that, to me, at least, anything like displeasure, or a perception of the ludicrous, would have seemed more irreverent on my part than was this simple, child-like rendering of the sublime Christian tragedy (i. 60).

This writer felt very differently about the second part of the play; so that we wonder, in reading her words, whether the *reserve* of which we speak below in the representation of parts of the Passion obtained in the same degree then: 'There was no sparing of agony, and blood, and horror; it was our Lord's Passion stripped of all its spiritual suffering—it was alone the anguish of the flesh—it was the material side of Catholicism. . . . Both my companion and myself turned away from this spectacle'—the Crucifixion—'sick with horror' (i. 62). We cannot imagine anyone being compelled to do so by the sight as presented to-day.

The *Art Student's* description of the Christus reads wonderfully fresh and vivid to those who have witnessed the presentation as Mayr and Lang have enacted it:

'Throughout his conception and attempt at the embodiment of the awful, unapproachable character of Christ there had flowed a subdued current of the deepest feeling, a sentiment of true poetry, a piety, an appreciation of the highest heroism—that heroism which is shown in self-annihilation for the salvation of suffering humanity' (i. 64).

This serves to bring out very beautifully the continuity in the conception of the Christus which has pervaded the play for fifty years, besides exhibiting the difference—and we think that there must be a difference, so sympathetic is the writer in all else—between the delineation of the Passion as Daisenberger must have found it in the village, and that to which he ultimately brought it.

We now pass on to the drama itself, and the personality of the venerable *Pfarrer* Daisenberger, to whom it owes its present form.

By the path from the churchyard gate to the southern porch of the church there stands a simple monument, crowned by a lifelike bust, the work of an Ammergau artist. The face is rugged but venerable, with a strongly marked personality shining out through irregular features. One understands how this was the man, raised up by the providence of God, in a village a few miles off, to be what we are told in the epitaph that he was to the community of Ober Ammergau.

We
sona
only
form
auth
of th

Am
train

peop
what
intell
that

Y
tend
allow
assoc
anxi
long
bisho

T
could
powe
poten
intro
Livin
and
follow
polis

1
makin
their
2
3

‘Opfer freudigen
Seelsorger und Lehrer
dem treuen Freunde
und Berather
dem langjährigen
Leiter der Passion-Spiele
errichtet
in dankbarer Liebe
und Verehrung
von der Gemeinde
Ober-Ammergau.’

We are proceeding to show in detail how the spirit and personality of the man appear throughout the play, and that not only in the text but in the traditional acting of the performers.¹ And so we may give way at this point to the authoress of one of the manuals whose name is at the head of this paper :

‘For thirty years Daisenberger² was not only parish priest of Ober Ammergau, but the director of the Passion Play, remodelling, rewriting, training his peasant flock ; in a word, the soul of the whole thing.

‘The result, the whole atmosphere of the village and *morale* of the people, as well as the artistic excellence of their performance, tell us what the man must be who for more than a generation has been their intellectual leader, as well as all that is expressed in “Seelsorger,” that tender word which it is impossible to translate.’³

Yes, the word is impossible of translation—‘the soul-tender’ possibly comes as near it as the genius of English will allow ; and yet it just misses the pathos which comes from the associations of *sorgen*, with its suggestions of fearfulness and anxiety—the spirit which breathes to perfection through the long and solemn address which is delivered by an Anglican bishop before ordaining men to the priesthood.

This you feel the man was before all things ; else how could he have ordered the play so as to bring his dramatic power, so marked, so facile yet so rugged, to bear with the potency that it has on the single devotional purpose ? The introductory verses for the prologue which usher in each Living Picture—especially as recited this year by the majestic and venerable Mayr—and the songs for the Chorus which follow, have a rugged force and directness which no more polished lines could possess among such surroundings. You

¹ The villagers talk about him still with tender love and reverence, making it plain that his influence lives on, not only on the stage, but in their homes.

² Daisenberger still lived and ministered when the words were written.

³ Maria Trench, p. 3.

look over the heads of the Chorus and over the stage behind them, at the Bavarian mountain-side, and you feel as though the words to which you listen had sprung of themselves among the pines.¹

Here is a specimen of them, and of their English rendering, the lines sung by the Chorus, kneeling and standing on the stage, during the tableau of the Veneration of the Cross which follows that of the Expulsion from Eden, and concludes the *Vorspiel* to the drama.

‘Ew’ger ! höre Deiner Kinder Stammeln,
Weil ein Kind ja nichts als stammeln kann ;²
Die beim grossen Opfer sich versammeln
Beten Dich voll heil’ger Ehrfurcht an.

Folget dem Versöhner nun zur Seite
Bis er seinen rauhen Dornenpfad
Durchgekämpft, und in heissem Streite
Blutend für uns ausgelitten hat.’

Neither of the rhymed versions, Miss Drew’s or Mr. Stead’s, is tolerable. Miss Maria Trench here, as everywhere, is very faithful to the original :

‘Eternal ! hear Thy children’s faltering prayer !
Only with stammering lips a child can pray.
They who gather round the mighty offering
In holy veneration worship Thee.
Follow the Atoner now beside,
Until He His rough and thorny path
Hath fully run,—in fiercest strife
Bleeding, fought for us, and won the fight.’

The parish priest of the villagers was so entirely in sympathy with them—a man of the people like themselves—yet towered so far above them in intellectual and spiritual gifts, that his verses express their life refined into a spiritual atmosphere which is theirs and which yet is all the world’s—so far as the world can be worthy of it.

The task which lay before him was this—so to handle the sacred story that absolute faithfulness to the Gospels should be compatible with the march and development of what must

¹ The whole effect, by the way, of this sight of the hills and the clouds as the ultimate background of the play is comparable to only one thing in the experience of the present writer—the sight through the roof of the Pantheon of the clouds and the birds above. Without it the play would lose, as the *ensemble* of the Pantheon lost when the circular orifice was closed for the funeral of Victor Emmanuel.

² For this second line—which reminds us of Tennyson’s ‘and with no language but a cry’—the official text of this year has substituted the much less forcible words, ‘Hör’ den Dank der Herzen dann.’

be 'an acting play'; to develop suggestions from the Gospels into legitimate dramatic situations; to set forth the play of motive, the working of human passion, the self-identity of every character—who shall yet be a character, a living man, not the abstract 'Vice' or 'Virtue' of the mediæval Miracle Play, not a passion embodied as a man, but a man controlled by a passion.

It would be idle to pretend for a moment that the success has been quite perfect. Considering the devotional necessity for representing with faithfulness to facts the weary succession of hearings before Annas, before Caiaphas, before the Sanhedrim; then before Pilate, before Herod, and at last before Pilate again; considering the extraordinary length to which all this must drag out, it certainly would have been well to have curtailed the debates in the Sanhedrim. Or the scene in Herod's Court would, again, have lost nothing by curtailment. Nor would the action suffer at all if the scene—a short one, no doubt—of the dialogue of St. Peter and St. John with the suspicious servant of Annas had not been interpolated at all. And there is one more important point where an excision would be unspeakable gain. In the marvellous scene of the Deposition, where every detail of the action is followed in a stillness which can be *felt*—if only there were silence on the stage! Or if the same dramatic instinct which introduces the *Engel-Chor* to sing softly behind the scenes during the Washing of the Feet and the Communion, would substitute a whispered chant for the harsh, unnecessary voices which utter unmemorable words around the foot of the Cross! They form the one regrettable remembrance which the writer brought with him from the theatre, the one incomprehensible failure in the delicate instinct of Ober Ammergau, elsewhere so unfalteringly perfect.

It might be added, perhaps, that the women and some of the minor male characters break out on many occasions into exclamations and commonplace remarks which might be dispensed with to advantage.¹

But to pass from the occasional deficiencies to the character

¹ But then, as one reads the Gospels the Divine perfections of the Master are thrown into greater relief by the crassness and want of comprehension displayed by all His followers. Like the miserable, offensive puerilities of some of the apocryphal Gospels, the contrast between Him and His surroundings brings out the truthfulness of the picture, the impossibility of such a character being invented in such an age. And some of the utterances at Ober Ammergau which are felt to be other than adequate seem to serve a similar purpose—they make one feel what it must have been to Him to receive such unintelligent homage.

of the play as a whole—the development of the dramatic situations is not only admirable in itself, but is achieved with a faithfulness to Scripture which is worthy of the highest appreciation. The only considerable interpolation, the parting between Jesus and His mother, does more than justify itself by its simple beauty and pathos. And in it, and in another short scene which precedes the supper at Bethany, advantage is taken of the situation to introduce into the dialogue of the play more than one great saying of our Lord which could not be given in its real context.¹

The most notable dramatic feature in the development of motive and opportunity is the way in which the traders are made use of to work out the plots of the priests. There is no hint of this in the Gospels, but it has an unmistakable verisimilitude. At Philippi, and again at Ephesus, it needed the co-operation of covetousness, the disappointment of hopes of gain, to arouse the superstitions of the heathen to avenge their slighted divinities, and to bring the Jewish mob into concert with their Gentile neighbours. What, then, could appear more probable than that the irritation of the traders in the Temple should be made use of by the priests and Scribes? And then the approach to Judas being made through these same traders, and that at the very moment when he is smarting under a similar disappointment—the treatment of the situation is masterly. It serves to take the traitor-Apostle out of the category of unintelligible monsters, and to show him in the weakness of humanity overcome by crafty temptations.²

And, again, may it not be said reverently that St. John, in his treatment of the facts, departs from their historical order, to group them suggestively together in their bearing on the motives of the parties? He places the supper at Bethany in striking contiguity of order with the triumphal entry into the city, though it seems to be perfectly plain from the comparison of the different narratives that the triumphal entry was over three days before the supper,

¹ To give these introductions in their Ober Ammergau contexts would take up too much of our space; suffice it to say that, between the two scenes referred to, the prediction of the betrayal and sufferings and the pregnant sayings of our Lord addressed to the Greeks in the Temple are simply and artistically worked in.

² The writer was touched, not surprised, to hear that Gregor Lechner, who personated Judas Iscariot in the years 1870 to 1890 with such masterly tragic intensity, refused altogether to believe that Judas was ultimately lost. He maintained to the end of his life that the unhappy being whom he personated was a good man, carried away by an overmastering temptation, and that his Lord would never allow him to be lost.

and that the collocation of the two by St. John is intended to display to the reader how the motive of Judas Iscariot coincided with those of the priests.¹

For those who have not seen the play we must give in a little more detail the way in which all this is worked out. In the opening scene of all, when the cleansing of the Temple has been accomplished—it follows immediately on the entry, as placed by St. Matthew and St. Luke—the priests begin at once to work on the weakness of the mob, and bring them back to side with themselves. They have just accomplished their purpose, and elicited shouts of adherence, when voices are heard approaching, and the traders come tumultuously on the stage, clamouring for compensation and revenge. They are encouraged at once by the priests, who tell them to come in an hour and detail their grievance to the Sanhedrim. As soon as the council is opened, it is announced that the very men for a plot are actually ready to hand. The traders are then fetched in, are told that their losses shall be paid, and are encouraged to look forward to vengeance. They are told that the accomplishment of the plot can only be secured by night, and that, for this, information must be obtained. Then one of their number makes it known that he has some acquaintance with Judas, and that he thinks he might be open to a bribe. Next comes the supper at Bethany, to explain the motives of Judas. And then on the way to the city he remains behind the company, still brooding over the waste of the ointment, and doubting of continued allegiance. And while he still stands in debate the traders come in behind him, and after a little conversation the bargain is ratified on the spot.

Thus in the earlier scenes of the play the exact coincidence of motives which brings about the final catastrophe is prominently indicated and insisted upon. And this is kept up throughout. There are traders continually present. They serve as his evil genii to encourage Judas before the Sanhedrim; they are present with the soldiers in the garden; and in the magnificent climax, when Pilate has begun to waver, and announced that the people shall have a choice; it is again through the traders standing by them that Caiaphas and his fellow-conspirators go about to work up the people. They are present, watching their enemy as He bears, and as He hangs upon, the Cross.

¹ We do not forget the striking and difficult fact that St. John says expressly that it was 'on the morrow' after the supper at Bethany that the triumphal entry took place; the balance of all the considerations seems to point to the order in St. Mark as following the facts throughout.

Thus along with zeal for the law, and with determination on the part of its representatives to maintain their power over the people, the motive of sordid greed is continually kept to the front—prospective on the part of Judas, retrospective and revengeful in the traders. And the three work out together with a consistent, natural force which fulfils in a high degree the ordinary requirements of the stage, while it never obscures for a moment the general purport of the play, the fulfilment, through human means, of 'the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.'

And here, perhaps, is the opportunity for expanding our suggestion above about the light which is thrown on Greek tragedy by this particular feature in the development of the Ammergau play.

If the impotence of man before Fate be the all-pervading motive of Greek tragedy—the miserable, mocking antithesis between man, with his multifold motives, his struggles, his plans, his resolves, and the relentless, irresistible destiny which turns all his bootless endeavours to working out its own decrees—the corresponding motive at Ober Ammergau is the age-long, beneficent over-ruling, by which man's covetousness and his ambition, his cruelty, his unscrupulosity, his revenge, were but means whereby the Providence of God wrought out the redemption of the world. Man, the sport of Fate—crushed, ruined in spite of himself, his very virtues, no less than his crimes, turned all in the single direction of forcing him to dree his own destiny—in this lay the power of the Greek drama. Man rescued in spite of himself, his very crimes bringing about the redemption—it is this which is displayed in the Passion Play. The grand leading motive of the whole might be found in the first word from the Cross. When, in answer to the taunts and revilings, the meek sufferer utters His prayer, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,' the whole purpose of the tragedy is vindicated, its secret meaning laid bare. They knew not, in truth, what they did; for they were doing far more than they knew—what is expressed in the words of St. Paul,¹ when he says of his crucified Master that the nails which nailed Him to the tree served to cancel the bond against His people.

Thus the motive of the rugged drama set forth by the peasants of Ober Ammergau is the exact diametrical antithesis to that of the most cultured stage that the world has ever seen. But the two have this in common—that in each the fore-ordering of the unseen carries out a tremendous

¹ Col. ii. 14, 15, R. V.

190
pu
in
a t
dia
of
is
dir
to t
for
tra
one
the
app
corn
Ago
'rai
ban
ever
and
cons
I
true
keep
I
exqu
dram
one v
hewr
of a
when
are i
of th
—as
maje
traye
B
beari
able f
O
Christ
words
surpri

VOI

purpose through the acts of the men whom we see, acts done in conscious obedience to other and personal motives, without a thought of bringing anything about save their own immediate purpose. A veritable *Divina Commedia*, the blissfulest of ultimate triumphs, where all has been tragic to begin with, is set before the spectator with a moving simplicity and directness which leave almost nothing to be desired.

The 'irony' involved in all this it is almost unnecessary to touch upon. In every line for the strong-willed Caiaphas, for the old, weak, bloodthirsty Annas, for the petty, revengeful traders, for the self-deceiving, covetous Judas, one feels the one purpose running, the divine decree working out—'for they know not what they do.' And all this with a personal appeal which brings home to the Christian mind what the corresponding 'irony' must have been to the spectator of the *Agamemnon* or the *Antigone*.

And in like manner with the functions of the Chorus, that 'rainbow-clad band of crowned, noble-looking beings,'¹ 'that band of peasants, fresh from their daily work, every expression, every movement and action of the limbs full of dignity, grace, and beauty, of noble simplicity and entire absence of self-consciousness.'

Let the same authoress speak again: 'To me they were true *Schutzgeister* [guardian spirits], as they are called, keeping the soul in tune.'

It is this 'keeping the soul in tune' which the Chorus so exquisitely secures—what it doubtless secured in the Greek drama. But here, since the theme which we keep tune to is one which comes home to our very hearts, not all the rough-hewn angularity of the simple German verses can rob them of a potency of appeal which is inevitably somewhat lacking when even the majestic utterances of the Æschylean Chorus are intoned in modern ears. Indeed, the very roughness of the verse seems to add to the pathos of the appeal—as the frankness of imperfect drawing intensifies the moral majesty with which scenes from the Life of Lives are portrayed in Giotto's frescoes in the Arena Chapel at Padua.

But the portrayal of individual characters and the bearing of each upon the action is perhaps the most remarkable feature in the play, regarded simply as a play.

Of the filling-in which is absolutely necessary if the Christ is to be before us at all, it is unnecessary to say many words. Suffice it to indicate once for all that it rises surprisingly to the situation. It makes use, as indicated

¹ *The Passion Play at Ober Ammergau*, p. 5.

above, of sayings from other parts of the Gospels, in a reverent and appropriate way. And suggestions of phrases and thoughts which are not actually quoted are continually to be seen shining through it, to sustain it at the requisite level.

It is in the merely human characters that the power of the *Pfarrer*-dramatist comes out.

The little that we see of the Blessed Virgin is touching in its submissiveness and pathos—she is, as she is once made to call herself, when accepting the parting from her Son, 'the handmaid of the Lord,' suffering, faithful, humble, essentially the Mary of the Gospels.

It is into the characters of Caiaphas, Judas, and Pilate that the writer has thrown all his strength. Annas serves almost more as a foil to Caiaphas than in any other way, and in this he is admirable.

Caiaphas is, from first to last, the strong-willed, far-sighted schemer. Cool, unscrupulous, clear-sighted, he knows just what he sets before him, the removal of a danger to the commonwealth—a task entirely congenial, since the vindictiveness of a leader against his rival falls in at every stage with the misguided earnestness of the patriot and the self-deceiving zeal of the priest. But one never feels for a moment that the single leading purpose has to fear any serious competition from personal motives or spite. One feels in his case that personal malice never gets the upper hand. He is far too strong-willed and clear-headed to have gratified his personal feelings if imprisonment or any other measure would have served his purpose better.

And here it is that the character of Annas comes out as so perfect a foil. He is, all through the play, the spiteful, bloodthirsty enemy. The impotent malice of age has been working beforehand in his heart, but he has not had the force of character to give him hopes of getting his way. From the moment when Caiaphas gives the lead, to the moment when the message of Pilate, consigning the body to Joseph, is communicated to the priests round the Cross, the aged ex-high-priest is raging and clamouring for revenge. Before the message arrives, Caiaphas is for asking of Pilate that the body be buried with the malefactors—to destroy the last remnants of influence and to secure the supremacy of the law. But nothing will satisfy Annas unless for his personal satisfaction he sees it thrown to wild beasts.

A great point in the character of Caiaphas is the way in which his power comes out when a critical juncture demands it.

In
me
his
pla
ext
for
givi
say
tan
of
his
Up
actu
up
effe
ber

men
befo
supr
dem
worl
insol
have
swer
dem
again
inter
doub
plyin
of H
view
indifi
beca
impe
stand
a po
advan
exalt
But
dealin
Pilate
when
peopl
Here,

In this he is the very embodiment of the forceful leader of men. For instance, when he 'springs upon' the Sanhedrim his demand for the death of Christ. No one has contemplated it as yet: imprisonment is in every one's mind as the extremest measure that is called for. Then Caiaphas forcibly inquires of them what security imprisonment will give, points out the possibilities of failure, and then suddenly says, 'Er muss—sterben.' The effect is electrical and instantaneous—exactly what is seen in real life when a president of tremendous force of character enunciates a decision which his own strong will is determined, at all costs, to carry through. Up till then there has perhaps been a question—Is this to be actually decided upon? One moment—then some one gets up to make some suggestion about the details—the thing is effected once for all. So it is in everyday life. So Daisenberger exhibits it in the Sanhedrim.

But perhaps the most striking moments in the development of the character of Caiaphas are shown in the scenes before Pilate. After a formal acknowledgment of his supremacy, he assumes from the very first the attitude of demanding a right which he somehow intends to secure—working out the suggestion of the Gospels embodied in the insolent words, 'If He were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered Him unto thee.' And from this he never swerves, of carrying his point he never doubts. When Pilate demurs to the demand, and insists upon a proper inquiry, or again when he refers them to Herod, or when Herod refuses interference, the other priests are staggered, they begin to doubt of success. Not so the masterful Caiaphas. If complying with the demands of Pilate, if resorting to the Court of Herod, if going back to Pilate again will effect the end in view, he is ready to submit for the moment: he is perfectly indifferent about details, he can almost smile at checks, because he means to have his way, and he knows that his imperious determination will secure it, all obstacles notwithstanding. His words and his manner to Pilate are those of a powerful *man* against a weak, half-hearted *official*. The advantage of position, of nationality, of everything that can exalt the official are against him, he knows from the first. But he is Caiaphas the strong, he knows the man he is dealing with, and he never holds the issue in doubt. As Pilate wavers and trims he brings more force to bear. And when at last the tide fairly turns, and the appeal to the people is given, he is ready on the instant with his resources. Here, there, his ready messengers are sent with orders to

stir up the people, to bring his own party to the front and to keep disciples away. Here comes in a just noticeable touch, bringing out what is said above about the cool self-restraint of the strong man, in contrast with the simple vindictiveness which characterizes others of the plotters: as he sends his messengers out he instructs them to deter the other side 'by an outcry against them, by insult and mockery, by threats, and even, *if necessary*, by violence'—'Wenn es sein muss, durch Misshandlungen.' Annas would have ordered violence for its own sake. To Caiaphas it is a necessary evil, though the sufferers be but hostile Galileans.

All this gains immensely, of course, by the magnificent acting of Sebastian Lang, who takes the part again this year. But it is no case of the character being created by the genius of its present representative. He has but conceived the part in the spirit in which it is written.

If any doubt could be felt about this, the character of Pilate would dispel it; for this unquestionably suffers from the way it is represented this year. Bauer is a conscientious actor, who has evidently worked at his part, and who declaims it with a certain dignity. But he never is lost in it for a moment. He is the actor, not the character; he does not *become* what he represents. And yet the personality of Pilate as conceived in Daisenberger's embodiment of him is never in doubt for a moment. He has only his official position on which to take his stand, and this he conceives will be enough, in spite of his own want of backbone. Is he not the Emperor's representative before a crowd of natives? He is contemptuously ready to instruct them how Romans think and feel, to insult and to patronize them at once, meeting their charge of blasphemy by saying, 'Well, after all, He may be the son of some god.' He is ready to lay down very clearly how the Governor is bound to act. But there he begins and ends: there is no force in the man as a man. You can see that he is open to pressure from the very beginning of the interviews. He catches at the mention of Galilee as an excuse for transferring to Herod a disagreeable, if necessary, decision. He is ready to gratify malice by the gross injustice of the scourging—as a way of saving the victim which will call for less exertion than the doing of justice would involve. He sends a message to his wife that she need not be alarmed about Jesus, because he is '*making every effort* to save him'!—'Ich werde . . . alles aufbieten, ihn zu retten.' He is ready to be sarcastic to Caiaphas about his new-found zeal for Cæsar. But the sarcasm only scores a point, it does not dismiss the case.

He
effo
pris
and
exc
con
betw
ever
him
maj
set f
of d
wrot
J
of al
infin
rescu
buffe
rever
with
about
Germ
the f
As r
inves
tragic
from
denou
them
reass
last, a
of am
the m
drama
Th
It
many
except
its dev
be for
Dante
Bonifa
was r
Cherul
is no a

He moralizes when he ought to be acting; he is eloquent in effortless platitudes; he is kindly and condescending to the prisoner, and expresses his sympathy with Him at one time, and his great admiration at another—does everything, in fact, except rescue Him. He points out to the raging mob the contrast in character, in history, even in personal bearing, between Barabbas and Jesus: he is ready for anything and everything except the disagreeable possibility of finding himself denounced to the Emperor as careless about the majesty of Rome. In a word, he is the Pilate of the Gospels, set forth for the exigencies of the stage with a verisimilitude of detail which bespeaks the dramatic genius of the man who wrote the part.

But perhaps the personality of Judas is the deepest study of all. And here the task of the writer must have been infinitely harder than in the others. He was called upon to rescue the character from being the subject of disgusting buffoonery, and to raise it to the tragic intensity which reverence and truthfulness demand. The scandalous scenes with Judas formed one of the prevailing causes which brought about the suppression of the 'Mysteries' all over the rest of Germany. And even at Ammergau itself these obtained in the fullest degree. They died hard in Daisenberger's despite. As recently as 1871, when the acting of Gregor Lechner invested the character which he bore with an unsurpassable tragic interest, there were shouts of uncontrollable laughter from the peasants in the cheaper seats when he frantically denounces the Sanhedrim and flings down the money before them—when even Caiaphas himself has to say something to reassure the assembly. And the curtain dropped on him at last, as he climbed the fatal tree, amid similar demonstrations of amusement. All this is, happily, at an end. Its survival is the measure of the difficulties with which the writer of the drama had to cope in developing his conception of Judas.

Thus he found it. How has he left it?

It stands out with a lurid intensity which has been felt by many spectators to throw everything else into the shade except the central interest of all. The culminating point of its development, in the opinion of the present writer, is to be found in a terrible passage recalling an episode in Dante—how Guido di Montefeltro obtained absolution from Boniface for a crime which had still to be committed, and was reminded when he came to die, by one of the 'neri Cherubini,' that demons can act upon logic, that absolution is no absolution so long as the intention is wrong.

Taking stock of the whole position as he soliloquizes over his bargain, the unhappy Judas concludes that he is safe however things issue: if the priests and Scribes are successful he has secured his money in advance, and will come in for credit besides, as having vindicated the majesty of the law. But if his Master wins, as He must, if He will exercise His power—why, then—then—— ‘I know Him well; He is kind, and never have I seen that He rejected a penitent. He will receive me back: yes, and I can take credit to myself for the service of having forced matters to a decision.’ And so he continues to moralize, saying that he has not broken the bridge behind him. Then he reflects on what lies before him. He fears how he will stand the Master’s eye, how his fellow-disciples ‘will think him a—a—’ then, as though he had heard the word shouted in his ear, he breaks out, ‘No, not a betrayer; a betrayer I never will be. What am I doing beyond showing the Jews where the Master can be seized at an appointed time? That is no betrayal; it takes more than that to make betrayal. Away, then, with these fancies! Courage, Judas, thy livelihood is at stake!’

This is the ‘psychological moment,’ and it is representative of the treatment of the character. Judas, like the other Apostles, has followed the Lord up till now with motives not wholly unmixed, has looked for political developments, with their opportunities of personal aggrandizement, as even James and John had done. He has had a personal love for Him—that comes out with terrible power at each stage of his growing despair, from the moment when he hears from Annas that death is the penalty agreed upon. But there have been the terrible yieldings, when opportunities of pilfering presented themselves, and these have grown till they mastered him. All this comes out by degrees, till the whole mental attitude of the man is disclosed with blood-curdling power.

First comes the scene at Bethany, his rebellion against the loving persistence which goes on exhorting and remonstrating when first his selfishness displays itself. He is bidden look into his heart, and say whether sympathy for the poor is the only motive there. And he has not the hardihood as yet to try to conceal his thoughts. He only replies, ‘At least three hundred denarii might have been gained by it. What a loss both to the poor *and to us!*’

But as soon as he finds himself alone the deep-seated discontent is disclosed, and the terrible hardening effect of his previous yieldings to temptation. The very words about

the
as
to
my
the
sich
him
An
hav

ten
the
He
Ma
follo
The
hav
whi
bare
itse

wh
Dai
mar
wor

they
from
The
in a
this

to
Juda
on t
be h
bows
min
Gali
reali
come
refus
scene
Who
stren

the sufferings of his Master are rankling in his covetous heart as the knell of his hopes of gain: 'He is always discoursing to us now about parting and death, and putting us off with mysterious words about a future which to me lies darkling in the distance. I have hoped and waited long. Now I am sick of hoping and waiting.' Then he actually comforts himself over his prudence in having filched from the bag. And so back to the three hundred denarii, and what he could have made of such a chance.

It is to a mind thus steeling itself in wrong that the final temptation presents itself in the shape of information from the traders about the reward which the Sanhedrim are offering. He can actually discourse to these strangers about the Master foreseeing His end, and making no provision for His followers. Hence the bargain is struck with little difficulty. They leave him, the audience still marvelling that he should have sunk so low. And then comes the awful moment which we have paralleled with Guido di Montefeltro, laying bare the abyss of self-deceit into which his soul has betrayed itself. After this, plainly anything is possible.

He is staggered for a moment, before the Sanhedrim, when Nicodemus breaks out on him for his treachery. But Daisenberger left this faltering to be expressed by the manner of the actor—did not feel that he need put it into words, so momentary and so slight is the hesitation.

And there is another most eloquent silence when just as they get to Gethsemane he gives the sign to the deputies from the Sanhedrim, that a kiss is to indicate the Man. The very enemies who are compassing the arrest start back in a momentary horror: Judas alone is indifferent. But all this is left to the actors—no word on either side.

Again, the first reaction, when he hears that death is to be the sentence, is developed with admirable skill. Judas is on the balcony with Annas, and is complimented on the service he has rendered, is told that his name will be handed down with an honourable place in history. He bows a servile acknowledgment—this, too, he had had in his mind. Then Annas goes on, 'Even before the feast shall the Galilean die.' At the sound of the fatal word, *sterben*, Judas realizes what he has done. But at first the reaction which comes out is only that whereby Nature asserts herself in a refusal to credit the worst. Through the short remainder of the scene he still thinks that he may turn them from their purpose. Who has not known the like—the species of desperate strength which bears up against a first fatal shock? 'Das

wollte ich nicht. Das will ich nicht!' So he replies to Annas, as if, alas! the irrevocable could be undone. And thus, again, when he rushes into the Sanhedrim to hurl down the money before them, he is persuading himself that he is free from blood-guiltiness. The Scribes attempt to pacify him—things are out of his guiding now. And then the very Rabbi who had paid down the chinking coins turns upon him and denounces him with scorn—'Du schändliche Verrätherseele! Wisse! Dein Meister muss sterben, und du hast ihn in den Tod geliefert!' He repeats the words after his taunter, then breaks out into hideous imprecations, summons them to meet him in hell, bursts away from them in a torrent of malediction which sweeps them off their feet for a moment—so that Caiaphas has to reassure them, himself imperturbable in his resolution, yet evidently taken hold of for the moment by the horror of what he has heard. 'Ein fürchterlicher Mensch!' he says. 'What a fearful creature!' one might render it, to get its mingled horror and contempt.

The sequel is worthy of what preceded—remorse and self-contempt deepening into final despair as the realization of all that he has done grows and grows upon his terrified soul. For simple, unexaggerated force the scene could hardly be surpassed. And yet it is pervaded throughout by the same reverential reserve which is so marked a feature of the play, not only in the conception of the writer, but in every detail of the performance. The Judas of Daisenberger, and of his interpreters, is the embodiment of tragic despair. Yet, saving the single moment of his desperate maledictions before the council, he is never the frantic creature, with whom sympathy becomes totally impossible. The wild imprecations of that moment do but throw into more lurid intensity the reasoned, *sane* abandonment of hope which characterizes the traitor's remorse. The brand which he bears upon his soul takes its character from the awful words, 'What thou doest, do quickly.' 'Good were it for that man if he had never been born.' An echo of them is heard again just before he climbs the tree—'Unglückselige Stunde da meine Mutter mich zur Welt gebracht.' But it is not—reverence forbids it on the stage—it is not the wild malediction of the third canto of the *Inferno*, 'Bestemmia vano Iddio e i lor parenti.' It is but 'unhappy hour in which my mother brought me into the world.' To hear these words at that moment, after the warnings addressed to him by his Master, is to realize as never before the meaning of 'the wrath of the Lamb,' to understand the boding words addressed to the Jewish nation, 'Fill ye up, then,

the measure of your fathers.' Yet his utterances, soul-freezing though they be, are kept within that circle of reserve which alike the reverence of a Christian and the dramatic sense of a grand writer imposed upon the creation of the part—he a man who had, doubtless, in his youth been accustomed to the sickening buffooneries handed down from his mediæval predecessors.

And here our study of the characters may give way to an appreciation of their embodiment.

Perhaps to anyone who has seen Gregor Lechner, Johan Zwink's presentation of Judas must be felt to be in some respects wanting. It is a fine conception all the same, though it lacks something of the absolute simplicity, the absence of a trace of self-consciousness which imparted to Lechner's Judas an interest almost unapproachable. The passion and the self-control which met in that marvellous presentation make it difficult to be fair to a successor. It never smacked of the stage for a moment, and this is more than could fairly be said of this year's embodiment of the part. This just misses being really satisfying because it is 'stagey' throughout; because, in other words, it is to a certain extent what the play as a whole is not—overstudied, a little mindful of the audience; the gestures, the intonation, the play of countenance just missing the inevitableness, the self-forgetfulness which characterize all great acting, and which are so pre-eminently desiderated at Ober Ammergau. Desiderated—yes, and secured, where they are most important of all, to a degree which nothing could bring about save the sacred traditions of the place.

That a Mayr and an Anton Lang could be raised up in actual succession to represent the Christ Himself in so adequately satisfying a fashion would have been impossible if it had not been a fact. The thought of seeing anyone attempt it seemed simply profane at first sight. Then the idea of seeing anyone else after what Mayr taught the world to expect must have seemed to many people a bar to a second visit. Some, at any rate, it nearly deterred, who yet came away this year with the feeling that, taken as a whole, the representation was more satisfying now than it was when they first saw the play. It was different—very different—different as it is well that things should be whenever a figure is removed which is, in its own way, irreplaceable. We must try to convey a sense of the difference.

Unquestionably, when Mayr was on the stage there was the sense of a stronger personality, of a more overwhelming

spiritual force than Lang could ever convey. The regal port, the commanding mien, the sense of overpowering awe which Mayr conveyed to all, are not to be found in his successor. And the loss is felt in many ways—particularly in the opening moments, on which, as in other dramas, so much of the whole depends. The first sight of Mayr, as he rode in, dispelled from every mind the last faint, lingering doubt whether anyone could be *endured* as the Christus, so entirely did he seem from the first to belong to a different world from those by whom he was surrounded. The words of the panic-stricken traders—'Woe! I cannot endure His glance'; 'Let us go, lest His curse annihilate us'—seemed extorted from their terrified hearts more inevitably than they do this year. And this same commanding force which inspired the more authoritative passages served another purpose as completely. It filled the more passive scenes with a sense of willing self-surrender, of power kept under reserve, which cannot be felt in the same way when the other aspect of the character has not been so forcibly embodied.

The sense that the outrages and injuries were sustained because Christ so willed it was marvellously present with Mayr. And the contrast between Barabbas and Jesus gained more by the regality of his bearing than it could have done from anything else. Yet the Christ as represented by Lang has a winning graciousness of presence than which nothing could be more perfect. It is not only the beautiful face, touching as it is in its grave sweetness. Nor is it only the grace of movement—perfect, apparently unstudied, the mere outcome of a gracious personality expressing itself without premeditation. It is that the whole sensitive frame seems vibrating to its every extremity in response to the demands made upon it by the remembrance of what is represented. A most marvellous instance of this was shown to the privileged spectators who were present on August 25.¹ The day had been dull throughout, with but occasional glints of sunshine and occasional showers of rain. When the curtain rose for the last time, on the final Tableau of the Ascension, the whole of the stage was in shadow, both the Christ and the allegorical figures. On a sudden a blaze of sunshine broke in through the wings on the west, and fell on the Christus alone. It first caught the shimmering garment until it became 'white and glistering,' and then fell full on the face, just as he began to ascend, while everything else lay in

¹ And also, we are told, on other days when a powerful sun was shining.

shadow. The hands were raised in benediction, with an inimitable tender grace far surpassing anything else in what had been so delicate throughout. Then, as the audience bent towards the stage, drawn by an irresistible magnetism, the face, already lighted from without, seemed to break into illumination from within which was almost more than earthly. The whole effect was inexpressibly beautiful, with a tender, winning majesty of loveliness surpassing all that could have been imagined.

If Mayr conceived of his Master as 'the chiefest among ten thousand,' surely Lang has embodied Him before the world as 'altogether lovely.'

But to give instances of this sensitive response to the demands of every situation. In the scene of the Washing of the Feet, agreed, perhaps, on every hand, to be the most perfect moment in the play, both now and when Mayr was the Christus, the royal grace of the Master did but 'make the action fine'; seemed to raise a menial office to the acknowledged height of glory which humility has attained under the Gospel. It was the absolute sincerity of the act which seemed to transpire through it all. A lesson, an acted precept; yes, it was that, no doubt, as our Lord represented it to be in the words which He spoke when it was finished. But here, as in the Gospel itself, the first, leading motive of the act was the simple, obvious intention of rendering a physical benefit to twelve poor, pride-bound men, all uncomfortable for want of the ablution, yet each resolved, in his foolishness, to let all remain unwashed rather than stoop to wash them himself. It is this, its naturalness and sincerity, which lends its beauty to the action as we find it narrated in the Gospel. And this shone through it transparently in its representation by Lang.¹

And so in the Garden of Gethsemane, in the journeys from tribunal to tribunal, and again in the Way of the Cross, no less sensitive instinct for the part could have brought out the growing exhaustion as it was displayed from moment to moment. Very gradually on each march and in each court, and with greater rapidity and intensity in the garden and in the bearing of the Cross, the strength was visibly ebbing; till the acme of exhaustion was reached as the wan figure was drawn up for a minute when the Cross had been laid upon

¹ N.B.—It is *the* basin (R. V.), not *a* basin (A.V.), into which He is said to pour the water—the basin which was there for the purpose, which each of them knew to be there, and which each was too proud to carry round.

Simon, and the women came forward to lament. And in the garden-scene the recovery was as wonderful as the exhaustion, when the spiritual struggle was over and the bodily worst had to be faced. The triumph of the meek, submitted will over the shrinking, weary body was expressed in its every fibre.

This scene, Gethsemane as a whole, is by far the most exacting in the play—the one where Mayr quite failed, where one spectator, at any rate, had made up his mind this year that unless in its opening moments it promised to be something more adequate he must close his eyes throughout, and only hear the words from the Gospels. It seemed simply impossible beforehand that anyone could rise to its embodiment. Opinions and tastes may differ as to *how far* Lang achieved the impossible. The eyes in question, at least, were never closed, but were riveted in thankful wonder through every moment of the scene. Not even the necessary failure of introducing an angel into the action—it is a different thing in the living pictures—could mar the pathos and the grandeur of the crushed, resolved Man of Sorrows as embodied by His lowly servant.

Space permits but one more instance of this delicate sensitiveness to the situation—the agonized shudder of the frame when the crown of thorns was forced down upon the brow. It communicated itself to whole rows of spectators in a creeping shiver of sympathy.

And yet—for here seems the place for enforcing it—the *reserve* which tempered all the realism on the part of every actor—soldiers, executioners, mob—was a matter for thankful relief at the most trying moments of all. The brutalities are rather indicated than expressed, a fact which does more than all the rest—more, if possible, than the conceptions of the leading characters—to show how the community of the village has been permeated with Daisenberger's spirit. One piece of unreserved brutality would mar the play as a whole—leave a jarring sense of irreverence. There is not one from first to last. The counsel so often given, especially to sensitive souls and to morbid, hysterical people, never to dwell too minutely on the physical sufferings of our Lord, receives its perfect visible embodiment in the bearing of every actor, and that with scarcely any detriment to the naturalness with which the parts are discharged. And, again, blood is hardly to be seen; its display is carefully minimized. When the executioners cast lots for the coat a few drops are to be seen upon it, suggesting what has been withheld; it is hardly shown at all upon the figure. For these mountaineers, at

least, the Cross is not 'more deeply than for others dashed with gouts of blood.'¹

It may be well to give a few more instances of the general spirit of the play, as it brings out the development in the community of this peculiar instinct for the drama.

It breathes through the living pictures, not only in their conception and arrangement—all due to an Ammergau man, Ludwig Lang, the director of the carving school. It is impossible to attempt to describe them, and it has been done many times already—with notable success by the same writer whom we have already quoted so often.² But one or two points may be noticed. The sympathetic understanding of child-life is one of their very notable features. Of the many children introduced, not one but is naturally posed, and grouped with the older figures with a subtle parental instinct. And at one special moment in the action—it is constantly presenting living pictures, studied with almost the care which is bestowed on the introductory tableaux—this is seen in touching perfection. When the women draw near to the Christ in the middle of the Way of Sorrows, two tiny children are with them, who stand in front of the sufferer and look up to Him with pitying eyes.³

The fact that in a village like Ober Ammergau it should be possible to develop such acting, carried out in so devotional a spirit, is the one patent fact before the world to make the place and its people that suggestive study in sociology of which we have spoken above. Englishmen who know them well, who have gone to spend their holidays among them in years when there was nothing going on beyond the routine of the village, assure us that the study is as interesting from another point of view, in regard to the spiritual influence which the play has exercised upon their lives.

But upon this it is not possible that we should enter. We confine ourselves to what lies upon the surface, the development of the artist spirit in ordinary peasant life. To pass from the life of to-day into the atmosphere of Ober Ammergau and its drama is like lifting the eyes for a

¹ Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, iv., 'The Mountain Gloom.'

² *The Passion Play at Ober Ammergau*, pp. 7, 17, 23.

³ Contrast this with a well-known picture, too true, alas! to real life, in which a boy is blowing a horn, as he marches along beside the Cross-bearer, carried away by the horrible excitement which boys sometimes feel in scenes of cruelty. Is the picture Flemish or Venetian? These children appear to have been introduced at some only of the representations.

minute above the showiness and the squalor of a busy modern city to where the spires of its cathedral soar aloft. Here, as nowhere else, you see in action the spirit which reared them, the conception of reverence and of beauty which sprang spontaneous then, and which cannot be worked up now, but which survive in their natural beauty in every scene of the play. You understand just how it was that the architect of a medieval cathedral found ordinary craftsmen's hands which were capable of expressing in stone his most intricate and delicate fancies; how the work of the lowest and the least was capable, as Ruskin has taught us, of carrying out the conceptions of the highest; how the secret of it all was just this—that these conceptions of the highest were not, like the art of to-day, artificial, antiquarian reproductions of what no one can spontaneously create, but were only the most perfect outcome of that which breathed in the life of the day.

To illustrate our meaning from the play. When Caiaphas enters the Sanhedrim, with the stately tread of a great Pontiff at ease among his splendid surroundings, uplifted into personal majesty as the outcome of official standing, and you know that the man before you will return that afternoon to the daily avocations of a craftsman, carving amid sawdust and chips, the problem forces itself on the attention, whence comes the stately grace with which he moves upon the stage? One moment in the day supplied the answer. All through the morning scenes the actors, down even to the children, have gone through their several parts in absolute forgetfulness of the audience. You have never been acknowledged as you sat there, save when you have been exhorted by the Chorus to lay to heart the lessons of the play. And you have felt that this total forgetfulness, this ignoring of the ordinary relations which prevail between the actor and his patrons, have been part of that atmosphere of devotion which gives the play its character; that you are living your life in one world, while the action which passes upon the stage is going forward in quite another. And you speculate how it is that the two can be harmonized into one by those who will pass back in a few hours to the every-day, bread-winning life which seems to contrast so strangely with all that they are doing at the moment. Then the two are harmonized before your eyes. You have been looking with wondering eyes at the unapproachable majesty of gait with which the venerable Prologue made his entry at the head of the Chorus—looking back, perhaps, to the day when you saw him represent the Christ. Then the drop-scene hides the

inner stage, and Burgomeister Mayr steps forward, still venerable, still with gracious aspect, but a craftsman in his Sunday clothes, whom you saw in his garden yesterday, with little children calling *Grossvater* around him. He bows to you in courteous acknowledgment of the strangers visiting his village, gives a notice, simply and unaffectedly, about the hour of the afternoon representation, bows to you again, and goes off. But written on the man in his whole aspect is that which explains the situation. The Prologue and the Burgomeister are distinct, distinct as are the splendid robes from the conventional Sunday clothes. But the man and his former part have become identified. He still is 'Christus-Mayr,' as he is always called in the village, the man who for twenty years had always to keep before his mind that he was called to live in the world as one who represented upon the stage the Man who is more than human. So you feel it to be with the whole community. Even in its every-day garb there is a different touch about the place from what you find in other villages. The engines scream at the station, the carriages come and go, there is a crowd of all nationalities about the village streets, and all the time there broods over the whole the spirit of a different age, the age which made the Passion Play possible.

Regarded, then, from the point of view of sociology, the play and the little community whose deepest life it represents have an interest unparalleled perhaps, as opening a vista before us into the life of 'the ages of faith.'

And yet this is but secondary after all. The deepest interest of all, as we said in our opening sentence, must ever be the purely devotional. We would leave it in the mind of the reader as the first and last thought of the play. And we cannot do better, perhaps, than conclude with the words of the Chorus, the last of the *Grabgesang*, sung just when the sacred body is being carried from Calvary to the grave.

'Christen, senkt am Pilgerstabe
Hin das Haupt in Ehrfurcht still;
Denn ihr steht am heiligen Grabe
Dessen, der statt goldner Gabe
Nur ein Herz voll Einfalt will.'

Of these words Mr. Stead's book gives a rhymed translation good enough to be reproduced here:

'Christians, low in adoration
Bow your heads, as here ye stand:
By His grave ye have your station,
Who, for gifts of consecration,
Doth a simple heart demand.'

SHORT NOTICES.

1. *East India: Use of Government Churches in India.* Papers relating to the use for Presbyterian and Wesleyan Services of Garrison Churches in India which have been Consecrated for the Service of the Church of England. Cd. 129. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1900.)
2. *Correspondence in the 'Times' on August 30, September 13, 18, 26, and October 3, 1900, between Dr. Story and G. Percy Henderson, Esq., I.C.S., and Letter from the Metropolitan of India on October 9.*

SINCE we dealt with this subject last January, the whole question has passed into a new phase. Our readers will remember, we trust, that a legal opinion had been asked for by the Secretary of State for India on the claims put forward by the Kirk of Scotland, and by non-established bodies, to make use of our consecrated churches as a matter not of courtesy but of right. That opinion has now been received. It is not printed in the Blue Book—out of consideration perhaps for the claimants, who have been treated throughout the whole question, alike at home and in India, by the Church of England and by Government, with a delicate consideration and courtesy most unlike their own loud-voiced assumptions.¹

But, writing to Dr. Theodore Marshall on November 10, 1899, the Secretary of State informs the General Assembly that

'the Church of England, to which community the overwhelming mass of the British in India belongs, has been recognized by successive statutes, and in the great majority of cases the churches used by it have been consecrated; the cost of their construction, maintenance, and decoration having, in consequence of the knowledge that they would be consecrated, been to a very large extent defrayed by voluntary subscriptions. Over such churches I believe, from the best legal opinions I can obtain, that the consecrating authority has control.'

In these sentences Lord George Hamilton—conspicuous all through the Blue Book alike for justice and for courtesy—lets it be known that the legal opinion is absolutely favourable to the Church of England, and does away once for all with the contention, so confidently—nay, so arrogantly—put forward, that Bishop Cotton, in

¹ The contrast between Bishop Welldon and those with whose demands he was dealing has been something of which, as English Churchmen, we may justly feel ourselves proud. This is markedly the case with his Lordship's letter in the *Times* of October 9, as contrasted with Dr. Story's venomous utterances. The Metropolitan's letter is based on the assumption, inevitable, alas! if regrettable, that Bishop Cotton's concession has left nothing for his successors to do but to work the arrangements of 1860 with as little friction as possible. The Government of India has been businesslike, and has observed strict official language in all its deliverances on the subject. The Secretary of State for India has been compelled in his more recent communications to intimate very plainly to his correspondents that they were determinedly putting themselves in the wrong (*Blue Book*, p. 41), but his treatment of them and their representatives has gone beyond mere official propriety; he has treated them all through the correspondence with the utmost consideration and sympathy.

lending our churches for the worship of Presbyterian soldiers, was not doing what he would with our own, but was, under cover of a concession, only acknowledging what belonged to them of right.

It is, moreover, very worthy of notice that, the legal claim once established, Lord George Hamilton puts before the world, and that in no grudging terms, an acknowledgment of those moral rights which had been so studiously and so cynically ignored when Lord Elgin was Viceroy in India.

This defeat all along the line is what has called Dr. Story to the front. The Committee of the General Assembly accepted the adverse decision with the dignity which becomes such a body. They brought forward no 'railing accusations,' attributed no bad motives, but quietly, and far from unnaturally, signified to the Secretary of State that as the law was found to be against them they would go to work to secure its alteration. For this it would be hard to find fault with them, except upon the score of our moral rights. But we call upon all English Churchmen to take notice that the glove has been thrown down. Are consecrated churches in India not to be used of right by any but ministers and congregations belonging to the Anglican Communion? Then the whole strength of the Scottish Establishment, a most powerful body politically, is to be bent towards altering the law, so that henceforth the case may be different.

There can be no doubt about the earnestness and the determination with which the campaign will be conducted. We would that English Churchmen in England were likely to take up with the same energy any question affecting brother-Churchmen as far away as India. Can they seriously believe, we would ask them, that England will remain unaffected if the principle of secular authority over consecrated churches in India is settled against the Church?

For this, be it observed, is the real issue. It is not only whether Presbyterian congregations are to be allowed to worship in our churches, and that as a matter of right. It is whether the control of those churches is to be taken from the Bishops who have consecrated them and placed in the hands of Government. It was this which the Government of Lord Elgin assumed that they had power to effect. It claimed, by resolution of Government, to place every church in India, to whose erection public funds had been devoted, under the authority of its executive officers, withdrawing them by a stroke of the pen from their lawful guardians, the Bishops. It is this unwarrantable claim which has been upset by the legal opinions since taken by the Secretary of State. It is this for which, in so many words, the General Assembly is going to agitate:

'I should like to call your Lordship's attention to this remark of your Lordship (v. *Blue Book*, p. 41): "Your contention seems to be that in all such cases"—cases, that is, in which a minister of the Scottish Establishment demands the use of a church, and the Metropolitan does not consider that the facilities asked for are reasonable, or reconcilable with the needs of the Church of England—"the Church of England should be ousted from any control over such church or chapel." I trust that there is nothing in any of my former letters which can fairly lead your Lord-

VOL. LI.—NO. CI.

P

ship to the conclusion that the Church of Scotland wishes to "oust" the Church of England from any control which properly belongs to it over churches or chapels. What we ask is that when the Church of Scotland is to use any particular church the authority to do so shall be given by a representative of the Government, and the hours at which it is to be used by the Church of Scotland also fixed by the same authority.¹

Such is the existing state of things, and such the attitude of the Church of Scotland as defined by its accredited representative, corresponding in the name of its corporation with the Secretary of State for India.

But the immediate occasion of this paper is not so much this state of things in itself, or as viewed by the Church of Scotland. A prominent official of that Church, a minister we are sorry to say, has appeared as its champion in the *Times*, with utterances so outrageous in their tone, and so unscrupulous in their treatment of facts, that we are compelled, distasteful as is the task, to expose the man and his methods.

He has been very well answered in the *Times* by an Anglican layman, Mr. Henderson, who writes with full knowledge and clear style. But it is obviously desirable that the facts of the case should be stated in a more permanent form, and that the attention of the Church at home should be most earnestly invited to the plots which are being hatched against consecrated buildings in India.

Perhaps, as far as history is concerned, it will be found the most effective treatment to print in parallel columns the facts and Dr. Story's account of them, italicising those portions of his statements to which we wish to draw attention opposite.

Dr. Story's Statements.

'They'[the consecrated churches] 'were erected by Government at the public expense

for the use of Her Majesty's British-born Protestant troops.'

Facts.

More than forty per cent. of their total cost was provided by private liberality, 'in consequence' [Secretary of State in *Blue Book*, p. 41] 'in consequence of the knowledge that they would be consecrated:' and that under deeds which set them apart for the performance of Anglican Services and no others.

The declaration that all non-Roman Catholic churches were intended for the use of Her Majesty's British-born Protestant troops was gradually evolved by successive Resolutions of Government between 1865 and 1885. Churches began to be consecrated as early as 1821. No inference as to their destination, at any rate between 1821 and 1865, can be drawn from Resolutions adopted in 1865 and subsequent years. As regards those erected and consecrated after 1865, the question still remains a purely legal one, not to be decided by Resolutions of the Executive Government.

¹ Dr. T. Marshall to Secretary of State, *Blue Book*, p. 43.

Dr. Story's Statements.

'At their erection no difference was made between troops of the Anglican and those of the Presbyterian persuasion.'

'The Bishop of the Diocese, whichever it might be, was always willing to consecrate. The Government made no objection, neither did the representatives of the Church of Scotland, not foreseeing what the result was to be. The only obstacle which arose was suggested by the Bishops themselves; they did not see their way to consecrate, *unless they got "a Deed of Gift"* conveying the fabrics to the Church of England. No objection to this was made by Government; no protest, most unfortunately, was offered on behalf of the unsuspecting Church of Scotland. *The Deed of Gift was issued.* The church was consecrated. Then the Bishop, having effected the legal transfer, and the religious appropriation of the now sacred edifice, *turned round and said*, "This House of God belongs to the Church of England, and no one must worship God in it except the members of the Anglican Communion."

It is on the strength of such statements as these—such distortions, nay, inversions of facts—that the officials of the Church of England are charged with sharp practice and dishonesty. For the sake of our common Christianity we omit to reproduce in these pages the wording of some of the accusations.

Facts.

From 1821 onwards a difference was made between troops of the Anglican persuasion and such as there may have been of any other persuasion; Government habitually and expressly sanctioning the consecration of the churches exclusively for the services of the Church of England and no others. Had the words in the Deeds of Consecration run only 'for the Services of the Church of England,' it might possibly have been argued that the existence of the, comparatively, few Presbyterians had been ignored. But the wording of the Deeds invariably and expressly excludes the use of any other services. Moreover, at the Presidency Towns, where alone they could be considered necessary, separate churches existed for Presbyterian worship.

No Bishop, except Dr. Middleton, first Bishop of Calcutta, has ever asked for a 'Deed of Gift,' and he died while the question of granting it was under discussion.

No 'Deed of Gift' was ever issued in a single case.

Instead of the Bishop's '*then*,' i.e. after Consecration, '*turning round*,' and declaring that this act had precluded the use of the churches by any other body, this exclusion is stated in so many words on the face of the Deed of Consecration, whose form was sanctioned by Government before it was used.

But to complete the condemnation of Dr. Story in words taken out of his own mouth, we will add two more sentences from his letter. 'The undoubted right of the Presbyterians to worship in these churches cannot be recognised' [*i.e.* by the officials of the Church of England] 'except as "a concession."' It is a new adaptation of that term, that when a man has been robbed of his possessions and demands their restoration he should be told he is seeking a "concession." These words were elicited by the publication of the Blue Book. And in that book Dr. Story has been told that the 'undoubted right of the Presbyterians to worship in these churches' has been absolutely and unanimously ruled out by the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, and of the other eminent counsel consulted by the Secretary of State,¹ as well as by that of Dr. Lushington in 1860.

The word 'undoubted' must have taken on, with Dr. Story, a meaning a good deal more novel than 'concession' appears to have taken in the mouth of any Anglican official, if a 'right' continues to be 'undoubted' after the professional authorities who have examined it have pronounced that it never existed.

But we should have written less strongly of Dr. Story had he confined himself to attacking our rights, and had not recklessly slandered our Bishops, the dead as well as the living.

Moreover, the persons whom he thus accuses of having 'robbed' his Communion of its 'possessions' have for the most part been long in their graves, and among the dead thus slanderously accused is to be included the generous Bishop Cotton, who conferred on Presbyterian soldiers the privilege of worshipping in our churches.

When a man inverts half the facts of the case, unscrupulously distorts the remainder, and, upon the strength of these distortions and perversions, brings recklessly slanderous accusations against his own long-deceased benefactor, we must think that in the eyes of honest men the language which we have used of him above will not appear too strong.

It is to be hoped, for the honour of the Kirk, that some one of its prominent officials may be found to step forward in public, and announce that Dr. Story's perversions represent nobody's position but his own.

Since the above was sent to press Dr. Story has reappeared in the *Times*. It argues little for the goodness of a cause, less still for the ingenuousness of its advocate, when a man whose statements of facts have been shown to be absolutely inaccurate repeats them in so many words after reading the proof of their inaccuracy, adding virulent abuse of his correspondent. This is all that Dr. Story has done in his letter of September 29, published on October 3—except, by the way, that he professes a belief that the last regulations of the Government of India, based on the legal rights of the Church of England instead of on Lord Elgin's usurpations, have not been confirmed by the India Office, and that the case is therefore still *sub judice*. If he can extract this scrap of consolation from the Blue Book

¹ *Blue Book*, pp. 46-7.

we will not grudge it to him, though we have failed to discover the evidence for it. The Secretary of State for India has said in so many words that he has no legal power to take our churches from the guardianship of the Bishops. We can very well trust him not to break the law, and so we part from Dr. Story.

A Sermon preached by the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK at the opening of the Church Congress at Newcastle-on-Tyne, on September 25, 1900. (York : Sampson, 1900.)

WHILE rancorous agitators are doing their utmost to foment strife, and to bring down on the Bishops that blessedness which has been promised to us when men revile us, and persecute us, and say all manner of evil against us falsely for the Lord's sake, the Bishops themselves are dealing with the thorny controversies of the day in a lofty spirit of Christian charity. They are not shirking the difficulties of their circumstances, but, as the Bishop of Winchester has just reminded Lord Portsmouth, they are for the most part accepting 'full responsibility' for what they are 'steadily endeavouring by God's help to do at a time of no small difficulty.'¹ The whole letter is a typical example of episcopal effort to be impartial, loyal to Church of England principles, ready to recognize the full rights of Catholic and Protestant tendencies in the Church of England, and zealous in the exercise of fatherly authority. Another example of wider application lies before us in the large-hearted and forbearing sermon of the northern primate. It was delivered to the Church Congress, we observe, on September 25, the day of the month on which in 1843 Newman preached his sermon on the parting of friends, and uttered his lament to his spiritual mother because it seemed to him that whatever was generous in purpose, and tender or deep in devotion, her flower and her promise, fell from her bosom and found no home within her arms.² No one who reads the sermon of the Archbishop of York can now feel that he must speak in those sad words which Newman used. Like the aged St. Peter, from whose Epistle the text, 'Finally, be ye all of one mind,' is taken, the Archbishop 'is full of loving anxiety for his fellow Christians.' The burden of the discourse is that while we are not, and probably never can be, all of the same opinion, we can at all events, and should, strive to be all of one mind, of one spirit, temper, purpose, and aim, in the Body of Christ. Naturally, in the circumstances of the religious world, in the present day the Archbishop first of all sees in St. Peter's words a reproof as well as a message of exhortation. The controversies, however, which have lately been so prominent in certain quarters of the public mind seem to the Archbishop to be concerned with matters of opinion rather than with vital principles. No doubt there are those on both sides who will strenuously oppose the accuracy of such a description of recent strife. But in support of his belief that the dispute 'is a warfare of theological opinion about matters with

¹ Letter published in the *Times*, October 6, 1900.

² *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 407.

respect to which there can be no certain knowledge and no final appeal,' the Archbishop proceeds to take into consideration the subject of the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. He inquires wherein the diversity of opinion lies, and how far it is consistent with our being all of one mind. This inquiry leads him rather to seek and to state the elements of truth held by both sides in the controversy, than to enunciate any independent statement of Eucharistic doctrine, with the view of persuading each party to extend the right hand of fellowship to the other. The Archbishop does well to remind us that the New Testament, the Catechism, and the Prayer Book Service for the Holy Communion are the authorities by which in the last resort members of the Church of England are to be guided in expressing their Eucharistic belief. The question as to the presence of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament, and particularly as to the conditions under which He is present there, is a revival in some sense, the Archbishop says, of the inquiry, 'How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?' He notes that our Lord in reply reaffirmed the truth, but did not explain the terms. The question of the conditions of the presence, he urges, is one of the theological speculation without any practical issue, for the efficacy of the Sacrament does not depend on any particular opinion about those conditions. The Archbishop believes that the central point of controversy is whether our Lord's presence is to be spoken of as in the Holy Sacrament—that is, in the celebration and administration of the Holy Sacrament—or in the material substances. He says that 'there are few who would wish to deny that our Blessed Lord is Himself actually present under some special conditions in the celebration and administration of the Holy Sacrament.' He rightly points out the danger of attempting to bring the mystery of this presence within the range of our own reasoning powers, and on the other hand alludes to the disaster which befalls men if they take refuge from difficulties 'by lowering to the level of an emotional experience the unspeakable gifts of the Body and Blood of Christ.' A short historical section of the sermon follows, in which the silence of the first three centuries, alike in patristic writings and in conciliar 'acts,' is noticed with regard to this controversy. Some difficulty had arisen in the time of St. Augustine, and the controversy culminated in the theory of transubstantiation in the ninth century. When the Archbishop endeavours to ascertain what may reasonably be inferred from the Holy Scriptures in connexion with the Holy Sacrament, he first concludes that our Lord's words in the sixth chapter of St. John must at least mean that 'Whatever else the Holy Communion may do for the faithful receiver, it is the continual communication to us of [our Lord's] perfect humanity for the purifying and perfecting of our fallen and sinful human nature.' St. Paul does but reaffirm 'in a more practical and personal manner the words of His Master.' The Archbishop presumes (and trusts, as we trust, that he is not mistaken) that there is scarcely any well-instructed and devout member of the Church of England who could refuse to accept this much at least of our Lord's own teaching, con-

firmed by the Church of England, that 'in the Holy Sacrament in some sense and under some conditions He gives us Himself,' and so 'is in some sense present with us.' The Archbishop proceeds further to speak of the conditions of that presence. He holds that the words of the Catechism inevitably suggest that the gift which they indicate is something exterior to ourselves because it is 'taken,' and on the other hand that the virtue of the Sacrament, while existing altogether independently of any faith on our part, is only capable of being received into the faithful heart. He adds that the Consecration prayer clearly teaches that we partake of our Lord's body and blood 'through the medium of the consecrated bread and wine.' Among the believers 'in the real presence of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament' the Archbishop reckons not only those who associate 'the idea of our Lord's presence with the consecrated elements as they hold them in their hands,' but those who lift up their hearts and simply say, 'With the eye of faith I see Him present, looking upon me with His ineffable love as I come to fulfil His commandment; and with all the power of thankful love I adore Him as my Saviour and my King.' The Archbishop does not pass by the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist. He says that 'it is impossible for anyone who is familiar with the service for Holy Communion to deny the presence in that service of this aspect of its character.' It is a 'spiritual' sacrifice, 'a sacrifice of memorial and not of propitiation.' But as in prayer we plead the merits of the one perfect all-sufficient sacrifice by speech, so in the Holy Sacrament we plead these merits in action as well as in speech, 'and there need be no difficulty on the part of anyone who uses that plea in his private prayer, to see it embodied in this Holy service.'¹ Whatever our opinions on this subject may be, the Archbishop concludes with a very earnest appeal to us all to be of the same mind 'as brothers in the great family of the Father in heaven.' This appeal, especially concerning Eucharistic controversy,² is not new. But it is all the better for that, and it comes to us with peculiar force and gentleness, with fresh power, in this peace-making and truly edifying sermon.

¹ We may add by way of a note on 1 Cor. xi. 26 that we cannot proclaim the Lord's death without believing in its efficacy. We cannot disclose our faith in its efficacy without an implicit reference to the Father's acceptance of that death as a sacrifice, which amounts to a pleading before Him of its virtue. That this is an historical aspect of the Holy Eucharist see Dr. Bright's *Ancient Collects*, p. 144.

² 'Thou oughtest to beware of curious and unprofitable searching into this most profound Sacrament' (*Imitation of Christ*, iv. 18; compare Hooker, *E. P.* v. 67. 3; *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 33).

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Argyll and the Isles. At the Synod held in St. John's Church, Oban, on Wednesday, August 15, 1900. By J. R. ALEX. CHINNERY-HALDANE, D.D., BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES. (Edinburgh: St. Giles's Printing Company; London: Elliot Stock, not dated.)

It is a great pleasure to us to call attention to this admirable Charge. After some references to local matters and to the 'diminution in the number of candidates for Holy Orders' 'during recent years' (p. 5), the Bishop goes on to speak about 'external controversies' (p. 9). He points out that even the denials of 'the ancient teaching of Christ's Church as to the Eucharist' and the 'words of coarse and profane impiety' which some have uttered, and the 'acts of violence and sacrilege' which have been committed, 'deplorable' as they are, are likely to tend 'in the long run to the more universal and faithful acceptance of the truth that has been assailed' (p. 9). Yet 'controversies about the Blessed Sacrament' may prove 'hindrances to the spiritual welfare of individual Christians,' as well as 'causes of scandalous disunion among believers in our Lord Jesus Christ' (p. 10).

The Bishop then refers to the two kinds of language—that of 'primitive antiquity' and that 'of Calvin or Zwingli'—found in the works of the 'Anglican writers of the sixteenth century,' and the 'degradation of the Holy Eucharist in the devotional system of the Church of England' which was brought about in lax times—by, let us add, the scandalous neglect of the provisions of the Book of Common Prayer—and asks the question, 'Whither shall we turn for guidance?' (pp. 11-13). His answer to the question is:

'Reason, experience of the past, and Divine Revelation, all point the same way, and unite in assuring us that if we would rightly understand the meaning of the Word of God, the surest and the safest way—the way of humble wisdom and prudence—the way of holy peace and rest—is to depend, neither on individual teachers, nor on the results of our own personal investigations, but rather on the general consent of Christ's Holy Church, and on that unchanging doctrine to which, in divers ways, she has from the beginning borne her faithful witness' (pp. 13-14).

The Bishop is careful to state that the theory of Transubstantiation goes beyond 'the patristic standard' (p. 12), and to allude to 'certain corruptions of the Faith during the Middle Ages' (p. 15), and so is able in complete loyalty to the Church of England and the Scottish Church to assert the 'doctrines,'

'first, that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice as well as a Feast upon a Sacrifice; secondly, that in it we have the most adorable Presence of our Lord and God and only Saviour Jesus Christ; and thirdly, that when we speak of that Presence we mean the Sacramental Presence of His blessed Body and of His precious Blood, under the forms of Bread and Wine' (p. 15).

After a brief consideration of the Scriptural evidence for these doctrines, the Bishop sets out 'two important considerations' (p. 18) on which there is certainly great need to insist at the present time.

The first of these 'considerations' is that 'the adorable Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament is a Presence not only of His Deity,' 'but a mysterious Presence of His Body and Blood' (p. 18).

'It is one of the characteristics,' he says, 'of modern misbelief that it often uses orthodox language in an unorthodox sense. This is notably the case among writers of a certain school of thought, with regard to the fundamental articles of the Christian Creed. Such persons, though professing, it may be, to believe in the Divinity of Christ, in His Incarnation, His Resurrection, His Ascension, and His Second Coming, do not, it is evident, understand these truths, or use the words intended to convey them to our minds, in their natural sense. And, in like manner, it is to be feared that some who express belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, do not mean the Presence of His Body and Blood' (p. 19).

The second 'consideration' concerns the 'bodily reality' of the 'spiritual body' (p. 25) with which our Lord rose from the dead and now lives in heaven.

'In our zeal,' he says, 'to insist upon the Scriptural and Catholic doctrine of the Real and Adorable Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, or in our desire to justify or explain that sacred truth, let us be on our guard against ever stating it in such a way as indirectly to obscure what has been revealed to us as to the true Ascension of our Lord from earth to heaven in that very Body with which He rose from the dead—in that very Body which still bore the sacred marks of His Passion—in that very Body which was visible to the Apostles on Olivet till the cloud received Him out of their sight—in that very Body which is now glorified in heaven, and with which He shall come again. We must be very careful, in short, in all that we say about the Blessed Sacrament, to distinguish between our Lord's hidden Presence under the forms of Bread and Wine, and His unveiled manifestation of Himself in that Heaven of Heavens, to which He ascended forty days after His Resurrection' (pp. 20-21).

Some further elucidation of this important point leads the Bishop to illustrate his meaning from the decree of the Council of Trent,

'which, though defining in stringent terms the doctrine of Transubstantiation, points out a distinction between our Saviour's Presence in heaven according to what is described as a "natural mode of existing" . . . and His being "Sacramentally present unto us in His own substance,"'

and the rubric at the end of the Order of Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer, which

'lays down for our acceptance much the same truth, in so far as it teaches that the natural Body of Christ is in heaven and not here;'

and to observe that the contrast in 'St. Paul's teaching in his first Epistle to the Corinthians' is not 'between the "natural" body of man and his spiritual or resurrection body' (p. 24).

'The Greek is *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, and in the Vulgate these words are translated *corpus animale*, *ψυχή* and *anima* being synonymous. The more exact English rendering of St. Paul's word would therefore be, not

"natural" but "animal." It is sown an "animal" body, it is raised a "spiritual" body. But the spiritual body is no more a spirit than the animal body is a soul. Both alike have bodily reality' (pp. 24-5).

We desire to express our most cordial thanks to the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles for his clear and balanced, courageous and opportune Charge, and our hope that it may be widely read.

The Ministry Spiritual. Addressed to the Diocese of Southwell, in his Fourth Visitation, by GEORGE RIDDING, D.D., First Bishop of Southwell. June 1900. (London and Derby: Bemrose and Sons, Limited; Nottingham: J. Bell and Son; Sisson and Parker; Southwell: John Whittingham.)

In any publication by the Bishop of Southwell we always expect to find marks of learning and earnest and reverent and deep thought. In reading his recent Charge our anticipations in this respect have not been disappointed. There are four main parts of the Charge, entitled respectively 'Principles of Ordinals,' 'The Effect of Church Parties on the Ministry,' 'Sacramental Grace,' 'The Spiritual Church.' To these is prefixed an introduction on 'The Bishop's Control of Lawlessness.' Throughout we feel we are reading the work of one who has much to say which deserves careful consideration, and who is earnestly desirous to see the real meaning of the questions which are pressing for solution, and to say what may go beneath the surface and be helpful to his hearers and readers.

The Bishop of Southwell is so independent of parties and so original as a thinker that we do not suppose anyone could read through his Charge without finding a good deal with which he felt disposed or compelled to disagree. Certainly we have frequently been unable to follow him. In particular his desire to be duly mindful of what is spiritual often leads him, in our opinion, to have insufficient regard for system and form.

The introduction is not less interesting than the four sections of the Charge. We regret that the Bishop has repeated his contention that in the concluding paragraph of the Warning before the Holy Communion there is no reference to Confession, a contention upon which, on a former occasion, we deemed it necessary to comment with some severity,¹ and which we still think utterly untenable. There are other details in the introduction from which we are obliged to dissent. But it is a matter of great satisfaction to us to find the Bishop strongly emphasizing the obligation of Daily Service. 'I am unable,' he says, 'to think its disuse justifiable'; 'there is no part of our Prayer Book system more distinctly ordered'; 'there is no order in the Prayer Book so distinct and fundamental' (pp. 15-16). He has words of rebuke for the 'very rare' 'omission of the Athanasian Creed' (pp. 16-17), and the practice by which 'some few clergy omit the Nicene Creed' (p. 17). He expresses his surprise and disapproval that 'it is so exceptional as to be unique' in the diocese of Southwell 'that notice of the Fasting Days be

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1898, pp. 3-12.

give
the
(pp.
Pray
and
Ord
com

deal
whic
is or
thir
latte
The
com
subj

that
not i
This
recei
chan
Bloo
mak
sym
Chri
As r
faith
mean

diffe
they
of a
spiri
of C

may
sym
Chri

T
Chun
make
and
offer
this
says,
assoc
inde

brea
Bish

given' (pp. 17-18). He deals at some length with questions about the number of communicants and the time of the Celebration (pp. 18-21); mentions his 'concern that the position given by our Prayer Book to Ascension Day is still not fully observed' (p. 21); and points out that 'the Warning and longer Exhortation' in the Order of Holy Communion 'teach lessons not useless for regular communicants' (p. 21).

It is impossible for us, within the limits of a Short Notice, to deal at all fully with a Charge which discusses matters several of which might well be dealt with separately in long articles. But there is one point to which we think it necessary to draw attention. The third section of the Charge is on 'Sacramental Grace.' In the latter part of the section the Bishop gives an outline of Dr. Pusey's *The Doctrine of the Real Presence*, and, after some very depreciatory comments on that famous book, sums up what he has to say on this subject in the following terms:

'It is a main argument of Dr. Pusey's against Transubstantiation that the change ascribed to Consecration is not physical but Sacramental, not in the elements, but in their Spiritual efficacy as a means of Grace. This is the very distinction maintained against Dr. Pusey's view by the received English Church teaching. Dr. Pusey makes Consecration change the elements themselves by attaching to them the Body and Blood of Christ; our Church teaches a Sacramental change, which makes the elements no longer mere bread and wine, but representative symbols carrying all the thoughts and spiritual associations belonging to Christ's Body and Blood, and offered as their representative embodiment. As means of Grace the symbols work subjectively on the soul of the faithful worshipper. On what Dr. Pusey teaches that they work as means of Grace, is not clear.

'Discussion has reduced to very small dimensions in words the differences between the two schools of Church thought. But in reality they differ in that one regards the Sacrament to be the human performance of a physical miracle, the other regards it as a means of Grace working spiritual influence on the soul which receives by faith the Real Presence of Christ.

'I trust the time may be near when reverence and real consideration may bridge this difference, and make the Holy Communion again not symbol only, but means of One Communion and Fellowship for all Christians' (p. 68).

This passage contains some, to us, astonishing statements. 'Our Church,' says the Bishop, 'teaches a Sacramental change which makes the elements' 'representative symbols carrying all the thoughts and spiritual associations belonging to Christ's Body and Blood, and offered as their representative embodiment.' In striking contrast to this description of the teaching of the English Church the Catechism says, 'The Body and Blood of Christ'—not 'the thoughts and spiritual associations belonging to Christ's Body and Blood'—'are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'

'On what Dr. Pusey teaches that they'—that is, the consecrated bread and wine—'work as means of Grace, is not clear,' are the Bishop's words. We should have thought it perfectly clear in

Dr. Pusey's teaching that the bread and wine, as such, work nothing; but that the Body and Blood of Christ, which they convey, works on the soul of the faithful recipient so as to impart to him great spiritual gifts. To select one passage out of many, Dr. Pusey says:

'Jesus comes to the souls and bodies of them who long for Him and prepare the narrow mansions of their hearts for such a Guest, not "as a stranger, a wayfaring man, that turneth aside to tarry for a night" . . . Prepare your souls, my sons, and so receive Him who is your Life; He will dwell in you, and Himself will strengthen you: in darkness, He will enlighten you, for He is Light: in passion, He, the All-Holy, will cool the fever of your blood, or rouse you to take the arms of prayer, at what time the tempter is wont to assault. He, the living Coal, which the Seraph touched not with his hands, will be a living Fire of love within you.'¹

'The school of Church thought,' says the Bishop again, of which he takes Dr. Pusey as the representative, 'regards the Sacrament to be the human performance of a physical miracle.' Now, if anything is clear, it is that Dr. Pusey would have shrunk from the idea of the Sacrament being a 'human performance' or 'a physical miracle.' His teaching is simply full of the thoughts that the consecration is a divine act, and that the work therein accomplished is spiritual, not 'physical.' We must limit ourselves to one quotation; but that, we believe, is thoroughly representative of Dr. Pusey's mind.

'Man,' he writes, 'placeth his hand . . . on the oblations with the words of consecration, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood"; and . . . Jesus makes the elements of this world His Body and Blood . . . He is not present in the same mode of existence in the Heavens and on the Altar. But "by a Divine virtue He raises His Body above the condition of a body and gives it a spiritual mode of existence," as He Himself speaks, when speaking of that great mystery in the words which St. John has recorded, "so that it exists as if it were a spirit, invisible and indivisible"; a likeness of which we see in the soul, which exists everywhere in the body and wholly in each part of it. But then the same Body, which is locally at the Right Hand of God, is supralocally, under a different mode of existence, present with us, really, truly, substantially, though spiritually.'² . . . He does not leave Heaven for us; His Presence there is necessary for us; yet, ere He left earth, He contrived a way whereby He should be continually present on earth; present, not, as when on earth, in one single place, but throughout the whole earth, wherever Christians are, for Him to come to, wherever, according to His holy Institution, His Words consecrate the oblations to be His Body and Blood.'³

It is impossible to doubt the Bishop of Southwell's desire to be fair and to bring out the real meaning of those of whose teaching

¹ Pusey, *University Sermons*, 1864-79, Sermon IV., p. 46.

² A very valuable statement of the different mode of existence of our Lord in Heaven and on the altar has recently appeared in the Charge of the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, of which there is a Short Notice in our present number, p. 216.

³ Pusey, *Addresses during a Retreat of the Companions of the Love of Jesus*, pp. 61, 64-5.

he s
have
for m
belie
phys
of S
that
grea
'hun
that

The

THE
para
Blac
state
Chun
subj
down
Mr.
Tran
rist o
in r
the r
defin
two
then
Aqui
entit
that
in th
corpe
after
eaten
not th
follow
'T
have

1
ance
memb
June
June
2
'only
but, a
senter
in the

he speaks. Still, we are bound to say that to our minds—and we have been close and sympathetic students of Dr. Pusey's writings for many years—a more unsuitable phrase to describe Dr. Pusey's belief about the Holy Eucharist than 'the human performance of a physical miracle' could hardly be found. We hope that the Bishop of Southwell, for whom we entertain deep respect, will note the fact that this phrase which he has used is protested against with the greatest earnestness by Dr. Pusey's disciples.¹ A divine act, not a 'human performance'; a spiritual fact, not 'a physical miracle'—that is the teaching which we know as Dr. Pusey's.

The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Real Presence Examined by the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas. By WILLIAM MCGARVEY, B.D. (Milwaukee, Wis. : The Young Churchman Co., 1900.)

THE object of this little book is described in the preface. It is 'to parallel the statements of' 'Articles XXVII. and XXIX.' and 'the Black Rubric or Declaration on Kneeling' 'with the same or similar statements in the works of St. Thomas, and thus to show that the Church of England has committed herself to no proposition on the subject of the Real Presence which has not been substantially laid down by the Angelic Doctor' (pp. 3-4). With this object in view Mr. McGarvey discusses the different senses in which the word Transubstantiation has been used; the definitions about the Eucharist of Pope Nicolas II., Pope Gregory VII., the University of Oxford in 1381 A.D., Archbishop Arundel, and the Council of Constance; the royal proclamation of the first year of King Edward VI.; the definition about the Eucharist of the Council of Trent; the Fifty-two Articles of 1553; and the Thirty-nine Articles of 1563. He then shows that there are parallels in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas for the English statements that the outward signs are real entities; that the substance of bread and wine is not annihilated; that the Body of Christ is locally only in heaven, and is not locally in the Sacrament; that the Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament corporally; that the Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament only after a spiritual manner; that the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is eaten² by faith; and that the wicked who receive the Sacrament are not thereby made partakers of Christ. He sums up his conclusion as follows:

'To me it is perfectly clear from the history of the two Articles we have considered, and of the Declaration on Kneeling, and also from the

¹ We observe that this phrase was at once repudiated on the appearance of the Charge in the newspapers by one of the speakers, not a member of the English Church Union, at the meeting of that Society on June 21. See the Rev. D. Stone's speech reported in the *Church Times*, June 22, 1900, p. 715.

² Mr. McGarvey says 'eaten only by faith.' It is true that the word 'only' in this context can be justified from the writings of St. Thomas; but, as a matter of fact, it does not occur in the English article in the sentence, 'The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.'

above comparison of their statements with those of St. Thomas Aquinas, that neither the Articles nor the rubric do more than reject a theory of Transubstantiation argued against by the Angel of the Schools himself. More than this, there is not one proposition in the Articles or the Black Rubric on the Real Presence which has not its exact parallel in his writings. And this agreement is not merely in general statement, but in the use of the very same terms and phrases' (p. 64).

It will be seen from what we have said that Mr. McGarvey has compiled a useful little book. It has long been known to scholars that the phraseology of the English formularies which some have supposed to involve a denial of the Real Presence, or of the reception of the Body of Christ by the wicked, or of the lawfulness of the adoration of our Lord in the Sacrament, is based upon expressions used by theologians who unquestionably believed in all these ; but it is well that this fact should be set out with the clearness and illustrated with the apt quotations which are found in Mr. McGarvey's work.

In thanking Mr. McGarvey for his defence of the formularies of the Church of England, it is well we should add that our sympathy with him would be at an end if we supposed that he was endeavouring by a side wind to commit the English Church to either form of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. We are ourselves convinced that the technical form of that doctrine was held by St. Thomas Aquinas and others, probably by some of the divines of the Council of Trent, together with a thorough maintenance of the spiritual character of the presence of the Body of our Lord and a belief that everything remains of the bread and wine of which there is any theological reason for asserting the continuance and reality. We are convinced that this would be true also of many Roman Catholic theologians since the time of the Council of Trent ; and we thankfully recognize the attempts which have been made by some recent Roman Catholic writers to emphasize the spiritual character of their belief and the fact that on their view the bread and wine are real entities in the consecrated Sacrament. That they themselves should see their way, with the definitions by which they are bound, to hold and value truths which we believe to be of importance is to us a matter of sincere rejoicing. But that is no reason why we should commit ourselves to unsatisfactory definitions from which we have been preserved by the Providence of God. There is need, we are convinced, of the greatest and clearest emphasis on the belief that by virtue of the act of consecration the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ. There is need also to beware lest we hamper our powers for defending this precious truth by the theory of Transubstantiation, which in its technical form, theologically unobjectionable as that may be, was the outcome of a philosophy which is now discredited, and, while it is therefore a source of weakness, affords no protection whatever to the doctrine of the Real Presence.

It is
of the
the
that
reco
whe
prac
of E
sanc
relat
beca
Lect
subj
add
to un
with
has
broa
whic
as d
then
man
now
this
pract
final
forma
as to
cerem
Wace
has at
power
simply
bided
resolu
a mor
consci
fulfil
contra
and ab
sacred
Tu
versy i
of the
decisio
the cle

English Religion. An Address on the Decisions of the Archbishops in regard to Incense, Lights, and the Reservation of the Sacrament. By the Rev. Prebendary HENRY WACE, D.D. (London : Skeffington and Son, 1900.)

It is not necessary to put before our readers any detailed account of the progress of controversy upon the Archbishops' utterances since the issue of our July number ; but we may express our satisfaction that the broad principle which is really at stake seems to be generally recognized on both sides. The principle is involved in the question whether or not an individual clergyman is free to introduce any practice from any part or age of the Catholic Church into the Church of England to which the Church of England does not give her official sanction. The more the details of controversy can be discussed in relation to that fundamental principle the better will it be. It is because Dr. Wace, as the readers of his extremely weighty Boyle Lectures will expect to find, looks at the broader principle of the subject that his address seems to us to be so valuable. And we may add that he increases his hold upon our attention because he is able to understand the point of view of those who are more in sympathy with the Tractarian position than he himself is. In this address he has endeavoured to look at the decisions and their results from a broader point of view than the precise legal character or obligation which attaches to the decisions. He asks first, What is the practical, as distinct from the merely legal, authority which they carry ? and then, What light is thrown by the decisions themselves, and by the manner in which they have been received, upon the great questions now at issue within the Church of England ? On the first point of this inquiry it is not necessary long to linger. These decisions have practically placed clergymen, says Dr. Wace, 'in possession of the final authority prescribed by the Prayer Book itself, short of the formal judgment of a court of law, for the solution of any questions as to the true construction of its directions on doubtful points of ceremony' (pp. 3-4). It is simply not true to say, in what Dr. Wace calls 'insolent language,' that the Archbishop of Canterbury has attempted 'to define, by an individual and autocratic exercise of power, the ceremonial practice of the Church of this land.' He has simply acted upon the direction of the Prayer Book, and, as there bidden, has left his suffragans to take order in accordance with his resolution. But Dr. Wace holds that every clergyman is now under a moral obligation to submit to the resolution, and either, if he is conscientiously of opinion that the Archbishops' decision does not fulfil the condition prescribed in the Prayer Book—that it be not contrary to anything contained in this Book—to appeal to the law, and abide by its decision, or else to relinquish the exercise of his sacred functions.

Turning to the light which is thrown upon the present controversy in the Church by the decisions themselves, and by the manner of their reception, Dr. Wace lays down the broad effect of the decisions that the Prayer Book is the one and only law by which the clergy of the Church of England are bound. When he proceeds

to examine the foundations of this standard, as both primitive and Protestant, we may think, and do think, that more qualification is needed than Dr. Wace expresses in saying that the framers of our Prayer Book and Articles 'threw in their lot with the Protestant Reformers' (p. 11). But to these two foundations he adds as a third element the English character as fusing together the other two with greater success than could be achieved in any other nation. This is the sober standard in matters of feeling as well as of faith which Dr. Wace sets up against any attempt to import other influences than those of the Prayer Book into our public worship, or to appeal to other standards or other laws. He contends for the English Churchmanship of the last three centuries against foreign and mediæval models; for the Prayer Book 'in its balance, in its comprehensiveness, in its combined Catholicism and Protestantism, in its "sober standard of feeling"' as more English than any other form of English religion. That is a standard, we are persuaded, round which many are prepared to rally with Dr. Wace who may in some respects differ from him.

The Reformation in Great Britain. By the late H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A., and the Rev. L. PULLAN, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1900.)

THIS is a valuable and timely contribution to the shilling series of Oxford Church Text Books, a series which entitles both its general editor and its publishers to the hearty thanks of the Church of England. Mr. Wakeman died before the little book was finished, and Mr. Pullan has completed it so well that the reader is not conscious of the joining process. In the preface he well describes Mr. Wakeman as 'a true Christian, a true gentleman, and a true scholar, "not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord."' The book provides educated Englishmen and Scotsmen with a brief but trustworthy account of the Reformation in their respective countries. It is not merely a narrative of the actions of the Reformers, but it endeavours to make the reader understand their 'thought' by giving special attention throughout to doctrine. The real character of the English Reformation settlement stands out more clearly in the book because it is set beside a somewhat detailed account of Calvinism, especially in its Scottish and Presbyterian form. This subject, as those will know who are familiar with the other volumes of the series, may be further studied in Mr. Kidd's two admirable little volumes on *The Articles of the Church of England*, and in another forthcoming volume which Mr. Kidd is announced to have in preparation on *The Reformation on the Continent*. Mr. Pullan is careful to explain the exact senses in which the words Catholic, Roman Catholic, and Protestant are used, and says that he has scrupulously avoided the use of 'High Church' and 'Low Church' as being designations which originated as terms of opprobrium. We may quote a short passage which shows clearly what the Reformation was understood to involve in England.

'The English Church retained most scrupulously, as she conceived it, the faith, the organization, the practice of the undivided Church, and as

part of that practice she found the rights of the conscience and of the intellect and the importance of intelligent worship freely maintained. In reasserting them after a long period of obscurity, she showed her appreciation of what was good and Catholic in Protestantism, and endeavoured to hold out a truer standard of Christian faith and life than either that of the corrupted Catholicism of Papal Rome, or that of the contradictory systems of the Continental reformers' (p. 13).

The chapter on the breach with Rome shows that Henry's divorce was a question which assumed immense importance for the English Church, because of the growing English dislike of Rome and the serious complications occasioned by the political and ecclesiastical state of Europe. The section on the Royal Supremacy (pp. 17-22) is an admirably clear and concise statement of the ground of Henry's rejection of the claims of the Pope to exercise administrative supremacy over England. When the breach with Rome took place the reformers in England desired to purge the English Church of superstitious practices, to take full advantage of the great helps to the acquisition and distribution of religious knowledge brought about by the new learning and the invention of printing, and to enable the laity to take an intelligent part in divine worship. Mr. Pullan describes the efforts made in Henry's reign to promote these wholesome changes. The reigns of Edward VI. and Mary are considered, not without advantage, in one chapter. In these eleven years 'a work of tragic magnitude had been accomplished. In 1547, in spite of such differences of opinion as may be found in every national branch of the Church Universal, the Church of England was united. In 1558 the most virulent party spirit was supreme, and every seed of future discord had been sown. A hundred years were needed to repair the mischief of eleven' (pp. 50-1). The reign of Elizabeth, 'the indomitable queen who, with all her faults, "loved our nation,"' whose services to the Church of England were perhaps even greater than Mr. Pullan estimates, was full of difficulties and important issues for both Church and nation, and the narrative is here conspicuously well compressed without being deprived of its interest. The great figure of Hooker stands clearly out in the midst against the attacks of the extreme Protestants and the extreme Romanists on either hand.

'His threefold appeal to human reason, Holy Scripture, and ecclesiastical tradition, constitutes a splendid vindication of the Church of England against Puritanism and Romanism. His deep piety kept him from using against the Puritans the ribald vehemence which too often disfigured their controversial books, and his wide reading made him openly assert that as far as the Roman Catholics follow reason and truth, "we fear not to tread in the selfsame steps wherein they have gone." His theology has its defects; he speaks with a somewhat uncertain sound even with regard to the Eucharist and the ministry. But then we must not regard him as an infallible Pope, but as he really was, a great theological pioneer. Just as some of the Fathers of the early Church who had to wage a double combat against half-Jewish and half-heathen heresies, occasionally fail in clearness or completeness, so it is with Hooker. But

VOL. LI.—NO. CI.

Q

in reverence for truth, in command of language, in unworldliness of life, and thoroughness of learning, Hooker is one of the noblest examples of what the reformed Church can produce' (p. 69).

The chapter on 'religious changes in Scotland' is a concise account of thrilling vicissitudes in the history of the Kingdom of God which are not so well known among English Churchmen as they deserve to be. The first period of the ancient ecclesiastical history of Scotland, from 425 to 1068, contains the names of St. Ninian, St. Columba, St. Aidan, and St. Margaret; it is a period rich in saints and in bards, bright with the memories of Iona and the Culdees, and of such abbeys as Melrose. But, as elsewhere, the fine gold became dim, and from 1400 to the eve of the Reformation the state of the Scottish Church was exceedingly corrupt. The Papacy was at its worst; the wealth of the Church was diverted from the parish churches, and high ecclesiastical places were obtained for the younger or even illegitimate children of the kings and greater nobles. A brief description of the archbishops of St. Andrews is given by way of illustrating the state of the Scottish Church at the eve of the Reformation (p. 77). The narrative descends to Wishart and to Knox. Wishart—whose name reminds us of Dr. Johnson's witty reference to a work 'against repentance'—is regarded by Mr. Pullan as 'the founder of Scottish Protestantism,' and some elements in Knox's character are brought out which are not always adequately recognized by Presbyterian writers. The final chapter of the book traces the history of the Reformation movement from James I. to Charles II. The opposition to Laud—'our great Archbishop and Martyr to whom perchance we owe it that we who now live are still members of a branch of the Church Catholic'¹—is explained by saying that he was unjustly involved in the unpopularity which in some districts had attached to the Church on account of the laxity of the clergy, and that his political principles and religious teaching alike fomented this unpopularity in many quarters. In the course of the chapter the well known narrative includes brief paragraphs on the new sects of the Independents, the Baptists, and the Quakers, the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, the Westminster Confession and other 'Catechisms.' Finally there are chronological tables of the kings of England and Scotland, and the Archbishops of Canterbury and St. Andrews, and of the chief events; a short appendix of selections from old Anglican divines on the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Prayers for the Departed, Sacramental Confession and Absolution, the sign of the Cross, and the explanation of the Eucharistic Vestments, and a satisfactory index.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. A New Translation, with a Brief Analysis. By W. G. RUTHERFORD, Head Master of Westminster. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1900.)

THERE is no lack of scholarly, practical, and devotional comments on this great Epistle, which the Head Master of Westminster

¹ Newman, *Par. Sermon*. ii. 340.

describes as 'once a plain letter concerned with a theme which plain men might understand.' Dr. Gifford, Dr. Liddon, Father Benson, Canon Gore, Professor Sanday, and Mr. Headlam have each in their several and characteristic ways made valuable contributions to the study of the Epistle which St. Paul addressed to the brotherhood of Rome, to the tradesmen, mechanics, and servants who rejoiced there in the fellowship of the saints. But this little work, with its new translation and brief analysis, will occupy a place and exercise a usefulness of its own. The preface will, we trust, give pause to those who think that the last word has been said on the Greek of the New Testament, or who in particular are disposed to admit that the renderings of the Revisers of 1881 attained to the summit of perfection. At the end of the preface the curious remark is made (p. xix) that a little light is thrown upon the explanation of rhetorical figures in St. Paul by the immense number of uncommon twists and turns in the writings of Disraeli. A few lines of analysis are placed at the head of each section of the translation. Removing from the main part of the Epistle the short epistolatory preface and conclusion the theme is described by saying that righteousness is created by faith and realized in faith, that all creation yearns for the triumph of righteousness, and this hope will certainly be attained, and that the history of the promise proves that faith is the only source of righteousness, and this doctrine of righteousness exercises a transforming power upon conduct. The translation is an attempt to exhibit the full force of St. Paul's idiomatic phraseology by an explanatory paraphrase wherever such is considered to be necessary. This method of rendering the Epistle seems to us likely to promote intelligent study of St. Paul among those who are at all disheartened by the pregnancy of his words and phrases. We can illustrate by a few quotations the kind of help which Dr. Rutherford gives to the beginner in the study of New Testament Greek, and, we may add, to those who have also already bestowed much pains on St. Paul's writings.

(i.) i. 3, 4. 'Concerning his Son, made man of David's race, avouched son of God when by an act of power conditioned by informing holiness He had been raised from the dead.'

(ii.) iii. 25. 'Whom God of old designed as a propitiation to be accepted by faith, a propitiation consisting in the shedding of His blood, ordained to make known God's righteousness for the remitting of past sins through His forbearance.'

(iii.) 'The love of God floods our hearts in the Holy Ghost that is given to us.'

(iv.) viii. 3. 'As for the law's incompetency, its insufficiency arising from man's carnal nature, God sent His own Son, made in the semblance of that sinful carnal nature and ordained to rid it of sin, and did give sentence of punishment against the sin inherent in that carnal nature, purposing thereby that the requirements of the law should be met in our case, whose actions spring not from carnal motives, but from spiritual.'

(v.) ix. 5. 'From whom so far as natural descent is concerned came the Christ, supreme over all, God blessed for everlasting. Amen.'

(vi.) xii. 19. 'Not retaliating, beloved brothers, but give place to the wrath of God.'

It will, of course, be seen from these extracts that Dr. Rutherford sometimes adopts renderings which necessarily place one sense upon a passage which has been taken, on strong grounds, in another sense. But he has certainly made some difficult passages clearer in the great Epistle in which St. Paul, in Mr. Keble's consummate description, sets forth 'as against both Jew and Gentile the process of salvation through Jesus Christ, including the two great doctrines of Justification by His blood and Sanctification by His Spirit,' and then shows 'how those great doctrines may be applied to all parts of Christian morality, and . . . to the solution of certain doubtful cases of conduct.'

The Apocalypse. An Introductory Study of the Revelation of St. John the Divine, being a Presentment of the Structure of the Book and of the Fundamental Principles of its Interpretation. By EDWARD WHITE BENSON, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1900.)

THIS work, like the Archbishop's *Cyprian*, allows us to catch a glimpse of the occupation of what may be called his private hours. Miss Margaret Benson, in her 'editor's preface,' tells us that she does not know when this book was actually begun, but for many years her father 'habitually worked at it before breakfast, and on any unoccupied Sunday afternoons' (Pref. p. ix). He took the MSS. of the Revelation with him to Ireland on his last journey, and was working at the book up to the day of his death. When that event took place the book was in all its parts complete, though in none was it finished. Miss Benson has wisely left a characteristic work rough-hewn, and in preparing the book for publication has done little more than remove obvious slips, trace references, and add a few editorial notes which are distinguished from the author's own. The Bishop of Durham read the proofs in slip, and has made a few critical remarks upon details of the work (for example, on pp. 117, 122, 158). The whole text of the book had been quickly read through by the Archbishop himself, the beginning and the end had been carefully marked and revised, and a part of the last chapter had indeed been printed and approved. With his characteristic love of detail, the Archbishop had considered and decided upon the margins, the size of the page, and the manner of printing references.

The writers on the *Apocalypse of St. John*, like the commentators on St. Paul's description of the Man of Sin in the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, may be roughly described as those who assign to the sacred text past, present, or future meanings, and in both cases those who say that the subject of their comments is continuously receiving its fulfilment can give very strong reasons for their interpretation. A short extract will at once show what is the fundamental principle of Archbishop Benson's interpretation:

'All Christianity is "an Apocalypsis of the Nations," and this *Apocalypse of St. John* is its mirror. It was not a vision of events to appear dotted on the face of history after many ages. It was the Apocalypse,

the Unveiling to a great mind, of the New Age then beginning. Jesus was from that moment to be a factor and agent in the world's life, and to have every power in it arrayed against Him. His second coming to end it is pictured in the book as very distant. "I am coming fast" is the watchword of the book. For the book is the carrying out of Christ's Word to the High Priest—"From henceforth" (*ἀπ' ἀπρὸς*), "From this very moment you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of power and coming upon the clouds of the heaven" (St. Matt. xxvi. 64). It is His attribute, as it is an attribute of the Father Himself, that He is ever "coming" as He is received, ever more and more, until He is its Omega as well as its Alpha, "coming" into the world' (pp. 129-30).

It will be found upon examination, as is indicated in the Archbishop's own description of his work upon the title-page, that he places great reliance upon the structure of the book as affording clues to the meaning of it. He has endeavoured to write out the book 'fair as a beautiful work of art, the orderly workmanship of a great and beautiful soul seeing more and farther than other men.' He shows that it may be written out in a clear sequence of what in a drama would be acts and scenes; and for further elucidation he has given a running abstract in the margin, such headings to sections as keep the visions distinct, and a short prefatory table or 'breviate' to show at a glance the relation of the visions or sections to each other. The purpose of the Archbishop made it impossible to maintain 'the matchless free march of the old English,' but he has not fallen into the stupid blunder of supposing that fidelity to the sacred text forced him always to render the same Greek word into the same English word.¹ On the contrary, he fully recognizes, what all translators may note for their good, that

'so few words of different languages are more than partial equivalents for each other; so many terms correspond only in the main use, overlap each other, or fall just short of each other's force, or include two shades, or give only one shade out of two, or by association or derivation emphasize each a fraction, perhaps a different fraction, of their correspondence, that a determination to use always the same word for the rendering of some original word wrests the sense of sentences' (pp. 3-4).

For the Greek the text of Westcott and Hort has been followed, and the Archbishop hopes that 'their splendid accuracy' has not been diminished by slight change. In aiming at a clear presentment of what St. John wrote, without adding or interjecting any interpretation, the Archbishop found in the course of his work that he would be obliged to make some 'short attempts or essays to group certain characteristics of the book in a distinct form under a clear light.' There are five of these essays properly so called. Three of them are of an introductory nature, and precede the rendering of the text. The first essay enumerates the Persons divine and other who take part in the action, 'the *dramatis personæ* if it were a drama.' The appendix contains an elaborate note to this essay on the strongly advanced, but, as the Archbishop considers, 'utterly

¹ See the remarks of the New Testament Revisers in their Preface, 1881, Part II. § 2.

unworthy,' opinion that one of its *personae* is the Emperor Nero. The second essay deals with 'the Framework of the Vision,' and is divided into four parts, devoted to the consideration of the angelic guidance of the Seer, the vast scene (enclosing the spectator) upon which the action proceeds, the voices in the Apocalypse, and the division of the Action into seven parts by seven choice songs. The third essay, of great dogmatic value,¹ presents the 'Faith or belief or creed,' which St. John, in i. 5-8, marks out in four cardinal points, or primary articles, as a four-square foundation—the present position of Christ to man, the present relation of man to Christ, the coming again of Christ, and the 'Sovranty' (*sic*) of the Father. Within these four points 'the whole Apocalypse is mapped and charted. They are inseparable each from all. They are relevant to every fact, and every fact is relevant to them. No dogmatic statement can be true and Christian which has not its known bearings to them.' To this essay are added some modified selections—'aphorisms' the Archbishop calls them—from Auberlen, to exhibit certain true principles which he has brought out. After this preparatory matter comes the text, though not before we have had a further opportunity of seeing the structure of the book set out in outline in the 'breviate,' which summarizes the whole book, first under the heads of the powers of the world, the war against God, and the new world, then enlarges upon those three titles, and then gives what is really a minute analysis of the whole text. The text itself is a vivid rendering of St. John's language, so printed and arranged as to display the fundamental arrangement of the book, and accompanied by a few footnotes on certain passages and words. The fourth essay, which follows the text, is a discussion of the two questions, 'What was "Apocalypse"?' and what is "The Apocalypse"?' The fifth essay, characteristically entitled 'A Grammar of Ungrammar,' examines many details in St. John's language.² It is considered to have been the least finished

¹ On the Christology of the Apocalypse the reader who can discriminate may profitably consult Mr. Otley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, i. 131; and all readers would do well to study what Dr. Liddon has written on the 'divinity of Jesus Christ in the Apocalypse,' *Bampton Lectures*, p. 242 (8th edit.). We may refer also for the general study of the Apocalypse to Professor Godet's *Old Testament Studies*, p. 196, *New Testament Studies*, p. 294; Newman's *Sermons*, ii. 286. Our review of Professor Milligan's work on *The Revelation of St. John* appeared in January, 1887, p. 412, entitled 'The Spiritual Significance of the Apocalypse.' See also the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. lxxiv. 'St. John in Asia Minor: the Apocalypse'; No. lxxviii. 'On a hitherto Unpublished Syriac Version of the Apocalypse'; and No. xci. 'The Apocalypse and the Religion of the Empire.'

² Dr. Salmon, *Introduction*, pp. 284-5, thinks that the bad grammar accusation has been pushed too far. But it is as old as the time of Dionysius of Alexandria, who says in Euseb. vii. 25, that the author uses barbarous idioms. Dr. Salmon (p. 263) says that 'echoes of the Gospel records of the words of Jesus are to be found more frequently in this than in any other New Testament book, except perhaps the Epistle of St.

part of the whole work, and ends abruptly with a series of brief notes. The book is the outcome of reverent study of God's word as such, and it should be read in the spirit of the Collect for the Second Sunday in Advent. In the mind of St. John the Archbishop has seen mirrored

'a comprehensive and penetrating view of the principles which maintain the self-deceiving half of human nature in its death-struggles with a divine wisdom which slowly vanquishes it. He is a seer who sees within all the beneficence and majesty of government, behind all the wealth and grace of society, a spirit sitting which is dead against the Christ. He is the giver of truth about all those most potent influences which work under the life of all society, making merchandize of virtue and vice, of truth and policy; influences which work wonders in the life of civilization as we know it, and seem bright with undying fire; influences which have their seal not only in hostile anti-Christian religions or in old Rome, but in powerful churches reformed or unreformed, and no less in sects which have revolted from dogmas, and which do not permit their apostles to declaim against selfishness and greed' (pp. 176-7).

Pro Christo et Ecclesia. (London and New York: Macmillan, 1900.)

'A REPENTANT yet dubious soul,' who is 'bidden to nestle in the downy under-feathers of divine protection amid the winds of doubt' (p. 189), may be forgiven if he sees in this advice some traces of a feminine hand. When he is told further that the Church has always shown a radical failure of belief in Christ (p. 187), and that Christ Himself, as 'the supreme religious genius,' is distinguished by His 'uncompromising nonconformity' (pp. 3, 40), he is sure that he stands on solid ground when he questions the qualification of this anonymous writer for speaking on behalf of Christ and His Church at all. From some extravagant eulogy of this book in contemporary criticisms we were prepared to find that it was a work of some importance; but when, unguided by any preface, we studied what is without any humorous intention called the argument, and did our best to appreciate the true value of a copious outpouring of earnest sentiment, we came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to deal at any great length with its contents. The author has dressed up some precious fragments of Gospel truth in the popular drapery

James.' He observes also that in the quotations from Daniel, a book which is used in the Revelation more than elsewhere in the New Testament, St. John used not the LXX but the version of Theodotion. Yet he was not dependent on Theodotion (pp. 663-4). Mr. J. T. Bent (*Nineteenth Century* for December 1888) suggests that some of the imagery of the book was suggested by the volcanic cone called the island of Thera (*Θήρα*—the beast), and by an actual eruption. It will be in the recollection of readers of Eusebius, that in the important passage in which ecclesiastical books are divided into generally accepted, disputed, and rejected, the Revelation is curiously referred to the first or third class (Euseb. iii. 25). Dr. Salmon (p. 539) conjectures that this is because the book was received by so many churches, and because Eusebius himself felt inclined to follow Dionysius. Westcott (*Canon*, p. 377) says that the authenticity of the Apocalypse was first disputed in the West in the third century.

of much deceptive undenominationalism, and that is nearly all. It is quite true that our blessed Lord and Saviour was the friend of publicans and sinners, and that He taught His disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. It is also true that in the visible Church of Christ the evil is ever mingled with the good, that we who have been incorporated into fellowship with Christ must watch against worldliness and pride in our own hearts. But it is very easy to mix up this truth with a very large quantity of error, to forget that the Church of God is the purchased possession of the Incarnate Lord, that she is His Body, His Bride, the pillar and ground of the truth. It is easy to dismiss earnest contention for the faith once delivered unto the saints by branding it as Pharisaic, but it exposes the brander to the danger of depreciating the value of the truth as it is in Jesus. This vague writer, who is so anxious to expose the spirit of the Pharisee and the Sadducee in modern Christian conduct, speaks no clear word on the Person and Work of our Lord Jesus Christ, on the great facts of the Gospel, on the Sacraments which He appointed in His Church, or on the marks by which the Church is known. Yet the Acts of the Apostles, the inspired book '*pro Christo et ecclesia*,' is full of these things, and summarizes them in the words 'the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, the breaking of bread and the prayers.' A vague enthusiasm for certain elements of the mind of Christ is a fallacious guide when it is separated from other equally important elements, but it has its uses, as we trust it may have in the case of this writer, when it leads on to full acceptance of the whole counsel of God. Then will be the proper time to speak to others *pro Christo et ecclesia*.

The Church's Mind on Fasting Communion. By the Rev. E. F. WAYNE, M.A. (London: Skeffington, 1899.)

THIS little book was ready for publication in 1898, and was not, therefore, written in the light of recent discussions on the point with which it deals. The New Testament evidence from the Gospels and the First Epistle to the Corinthians is examined together with a good many passages from the Fathers and the Canons in their bearing upon the circumstances of our modern English life, and the writer, while fully recognizing the seemliness of communicating before breakfast, is led by his consideration of the whole matter in its practical aspects to deprecate rigorous insistence upon fasting reception of the Blessed Sacrament *in all cases*. We do not hesitate to say that we consider that the spirit of fasting Communion is dearer to us than the letter, and we are not without experience of some rigorist teaching and practice which seem to us to be contrary to true Eucharistic doctrine. But we should not say this unless we were prepared at the same time to recognize the tremendous force of the universal practice of the universal Church in favour of the practice of fasting Communion, a practice which has for us the force of law, only open to such necessary exceptions as the pressure of health or some other urgent cause. Mr. Wayne has not fully appreciated the value of the custom of the Church as a guide to

Churchmen in this matter, because, as in the case of Dr. Pusey's *Spiritual Letters* on the subject, he has rather dealt with rigorist interpretation of the custom.¹ The same observation may be made upon the more recent remarks of the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject.² When we ourselves have alluded to the custom we have often, from the nature of the occasion, specially alluded to the rigorist view. But we are even more desirous of speaking against too little care in this matter than against too much rigour, and the habitual practice of many of our non-fasting communicants seem to us to be without any proper parallel in Church history. On this account we must urge those who are disposed too easily to accept Mr. Wayne's plea to read the admirable paper which Father Puller printed in 1891, *Concerning the Fast before Communion*,³ in which, on pp. 4, 5, a valuable list of other works on the subject is given. If the appeal is to be made to ancient practice we must also bear in mind that fasting after reception was taken into account in the past.⁴

The Literary Study of the Bible: an Account of the Leading Forms of Literature represented in the Sacred Writings. By RICHARD G. MOULTON, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Literature in English in the University of Chicago. Revised and partly re-written. (London: Isbister and Co., Limited, 1899.)

THE first edition of this work appeared some four years ago, and in the present edition we have a new Preface, an additional Appendix on the Metrical System of Biblical Verse (pp. 525-65), a Reference Table for comparing the two editions, and an Index, making in all about seventy-five pages of new matter. The reader will feel at once that an abridgment would have been better than an enlargement, for, valuable and interesting as much of Professor Moulton's work is upon the literary study of the Bible, the student finds himself exhausted by the over-elaboration of the details and length of the illustrations. There is a danger that in the attempt to set forth the morphology of Hebrew poetry the real purpose of it as a vehicle for a Divine revelation should be forgotten; and though one might like for private use to have the structural methods exhibited to the eye by careful printing, we feel that a great deal more could be done for the hearer of the Bible by careful reading and management of the voice, and a due regard to punctuation, to make the psalmist or prophet intelligible to the unlearned; whereas the effect of an elaborate textual arrangement, such as Professor Moulton employs, would be thrown away upon those who are not well-instructed scholars. It has always

¹ *Spiritual Letters*, p. 267.

² See our Short Notice of the Bishop of London's Charge, No. 99, p. 223; and on the Archbishop of Canterbury's decision on Reservation, No. 100, p. 464.

³ London: Masters; and New York: Pott.

⁴ See Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 808; and on the general subject of fasting Communion see pp. 36-9, 1036. For usages as to fasting in the Anglo-Saxon Church see under 'Fasting' in the index of Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church History* (edition 3, 1897).

seemed to us that the steady chanting of the Psalms by a good choir, and the observance of the colon in the middle of the verse in saying the Psalms, as the Prayer-book directs, will bring out the parallelism of the poetry and the pendulum movement of the varying thought, while care on the part of the clergyman or choirmaster will ensure that the several stanzas shall not be overlooked, and the oft-recurring refrain shall be emphasised. In saying and singing the Psalms it is quite possible to produce the effects of Hebrew poetry, with Bishop Coverdale's version, without having recourse to a type of printing which makes the Psalms look strange to the worshipper; but, unfortunately, there is a tendency in some places to gabble the Psalms and overlook the structure of them as printed in the Prayer-book, and so to obscure the literary effect of the Hebrew verse. At the same time we are not ungrateful to Professor Moulton for what he has done to elucidate the morphology of the Bible, and we are able to endorse many of his complaints, and to congratulate the Revisers upon the printing of their version so as to ignore the artificial dismemberment of a poem or theme by chapters and verses, and to bring out the distinction between prose and poetry. The Professor did quite right to complain of the uninteresting form of the Authorized Version, in which 'the whole' is 'divided up into sentences of a convenient length for parsing' (p. iii), and to assert that 'the Bible is the worst-printed book in the world' (p. 45); but he must remember that literary study, however helpful, is not the first purpose of the Sacred Writings, and that to print the Bible as he appears to advocate would be to put a prohibitive price upon it. In the Preface (pp. iv-v) he explains that by literary study he means 'morphological treatment,' language and history being separated from it, and it is just here that he spoils his own case; for, as we shall see, in his analysis of the contents of the Bible this pursuit of morphological arrangement has made him sometimes ignore the obvious divisions of the books. This will be seen in his division of 'The Rhapsody of Zion Redeemed' (Isaiah xl.-lxvi.) into seven sections (chapter xix.), whereas it is plain that those twenty-seven chapters consist of three portions of nine chapters each; but the Professor's object is to bring to notice certain headings of his own devising. This is to make literary study an object in itself, instead of a handmaid to interpretation. It is of no great importance to be told 'this is epic,' 'that is lyric,' 'that is dramatic,' unless at the same time we are thereby put in a better position to understand the meaning of the revelation. Literature cannot, like philosophy, be divorced from language and history, because it would become mere form without substance, and the Professor seems to feel this himself sometimes, for he says, 'Other languages may surpass Hebrew as vehicles for precision of thought. But the harmonization of recitative and rhythm, on the common ground of high parallelism, has provided for the Bible the most elastic medium of expression which the world's literatures contain' (p. 129). The contents of the volume may be briefly summed up as follows, viz.: *First*, the Book of Job is examined as typical of the whole literature of the Bible, and as containing all the forms, more

or less, which are to be subsequently discussed; and this Introduction (pp. 3-44) is without doubt the most interesting portion of the whole volume. It will not attract the reader quite in the same way as Mozley's or Froude's essays on the Book of Job, but as a study of the structure of that great drama it deserves careful attention. Nothing seems to have been overlooked, unless it be the typical aspect of the sufferer in relation to the Servant of Jehovah; this might have been included under the prophetic section (p. 39), but probably the Professor considered it a theological question beyond his province. After the Introduction follow six books dealing respectively with (1) the literary forms of the Bible, (2) lyric poetry, (3) epic, (4) rhetoric, (5) philosophy, and (6) prophecy (pp. 45-476). It is here that we could have desired curtailment, especially as Appendix I. contains a full analysis of the books of the Bible, with a classification of their contents and headings to the several parts; and Appendix II. gives a full account of the several types of poetry, with the illustrations which have been dealt with in the preceding chapters. We feel that Professor Moulton might in a future edition avoid this repetition, and reduce the whole to a handy volume, with a few well-chosen specimens of textual arrangement by way of illustration. Appendix III., on 'The Metrical System of Biblical Verse,' is largely a summary of types and structures which have been already presented in the lectures, though it professes to be new matter. The Reference Table for the two editions might well disappear, but the Index is most necessary where so many technical terms are employed.

We have already mentioned one case in which the natural divisions of a portion of the Bible (Isaiah xl.-lxvi.) are ignored, but we must notice one or two other cases; viz. in Genesis no notice is taken of the heading which recurs throughout, 'These are the generations of . . .'; in Deuteronomy 'the Book of the Covenant' (chap. xii.-xxvi.) is treated as no part of the third address of Moses; in Job xxv.-xxviii. an attempt at rearrangement of text is made, following Grätz and Cheyne, and against the views of Davidson and Driver; in Jeremiah the arrangement in historical groups is ignored; in Micah the natural division of chaps. i.-ii., iii.-v., vi.-vii. is put aside for no good reason. At the same time it will be allowed that the treatment of Ecclesiastes, except for the break made at verse 6 in chap. xi., is very striking, especially when he brings out the five leading themes of it; and the arrangement of Ezekiel in seven books is suggestive, as is also the view of Malachi as 'a dialectic cycle' of seven discourses. The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus are skilfully handled; indeed, the whole series of the Wisdom literature is dealt with more ably than many other parts of the Bible, but it is a little startling to have St. James's Epistle and the First Epistle of St. John included in this category. There are many suggestions and hints scattered up and down the pages of this volume which deserve attention, e.g. the musical rendering of the Psalms (p. 63), where a system of what have been called 'three-legged chants' appears to be advocated; some remarks on the Revised Version

(p. 91), an ingenious conjecture respecting Heber the Kenite as 'a spy in the pay of Jabin and Sisera' (pp. 134, 135), and an (impossible) interpretation of Immanuel in Isaiah vii. 11 (pp. 378-9, note), but we have not space for details of this kind. Our hope was, in reading Professor Moulton's book, that the literary study of the Bible would lend itself, as we believe it ought to do, to the rejection of much that the 'Higher Criticism' has assumed. The Professor stands aloof from such criticism; he is concerned only with the books of the Bible as they stand, *i.e.* as literary compositions; but we find him sometimes adopting the results of this criticism, *e.g.* in the separation of Isaiah and Zechariah into two volumes, and sometimes throwing out hints that an argument might be used from literary grounds against assumptions based upon philological data. We are grateful to him for these crumbs of comfort, but it appears to us that he might have gone much further without doing any harm to his general review of the Biblical literature. In the Preface (p. vi) he says of the 'Higher Criticism' that it seems to him

'in the main an historical analysis. Its allegiance is not to literature, but to Semitic Studies, in which literary questions are inextricably woven with questions of language and history. It goes beyond the text of Scripture to a further inquiry into the authority of the existing text, its mode of composition, the dates and surrounding conditions of its authorship. Historic questions of this kind the Higher Criticism examines by historic methods.'

But here he stops short, saying that he is concerned only with 'what we have in the text of the Bible, without examining *how* it has come to us.' Later on, however, he points out (p. ix) that 'if the foundation principle of literary study be true, this existing text cannot be truly interpreted until it has been read in the light of its exact literary structure.' And he adds, 'Biblical criticism at the present time is, not unfrequently, vitiated in its historical contentions by tacit assumptions as to the form of the text such as literary examination might have corrected.' In proof of what he has said he takes Micah vii. 7-10, and shows (as against Wellhausen) that the dramatic character of the whole chapter demands the change of tone in these verses, because 'the Man of Wisdom' has to express 'the happy confidence of one on whose side the divine intervention is to take place' (p. x). Now this suggestion of our author makes us ask three questions in conclusion, *viz.* (1) Could not the literary study of the Bible be employed to establish, not merely the unity of the particular book, but also the unity of its authorship? We should like Professor Moulton to consider this in relation to Isaiah as a whole. We feel sure from the way in which he has treated the unity of Psalm xix. (pp. 95-100) that he could render valuable service in this respect; and a suggestion about Zechariah and Malachi (p. 470) may be worth considering in connection with this question of authorship. (2) Could not literary study, if not dissociated from history and language, assist in ascertaining the dates of certain books and poems? We think the Professor feels this in his treatment of those Psalms which are traditionally connected with the removal of the Ark to

Zio
(pp
wri
as t
as a
min

atte
thro
deli
tha
a c
cer
a cl
any
sitt
Dra

Of

Pro
Na
Na
no
cha

He
hist
ver
whi
rele
We
and
far
wha
pro
xiv.
the

Lig

TH
larg
and
vol
no
evic
Mr.
may
seri

Zion (2 Samuel vi.), or, as he calls it, 'the inauguration of Jerusalem' (pp. 159-60). (3) Could not literary study show us that certain writings in the Bible are what they profess to be, e.g. Deuteronomy, as the last addresses of Moses himself to Israel; or the book of Jonah, as a real prophetic history? We fancy that the Professor has this in mind when he writes of the one:

'There is, perhaps, no other work in which so much is gained by attempting to read the whole at a sitting . . . An intense interest is thrown upon the orations from the pathetic situation in which they are delivered; the leader of the Hebrews in their wanderings alone realising that promised land from which he alone is excluded . . . There is also a crescendo of interest throughout the book; narrative review, appeal, ceremonial and terrible denunciation, farewell and personal tenderness, a climax of song, simple story of the solemn and pathetic end. Read in any way, Deuteronomy reveals its rhetoric richness; read at a single sitting, it is seen to be oratory arranged to produce all the effect of Drama' (pp. 268, 269).

Of the other he says—

'The Book of Jonah is contained amongst the books of the Minor Prophets, yet every reader feels how different it is from all the rest. Nahum and Jonah alike received a commission to denounce Nineveh; Nahum gives us the usual prophetic discourse; the other book contains no discourse, but describes the actions of Jonah precisely as certain chapters in the Book of Kings describe the actions of Elijah' (p. 246).

He regards it as an epic prophecy, a record of a prophet's work, and historical, and containing a prophetic revelation (pp. 247-9). How very different is this estimate from that of the 'Higher Criticism' which would exclude Jonah from the writings of the prophets, and relegate it to the province of *allegory*, and regard it as post-exilic! We think that the literary study of these two books, Deuteronomy and Jonah, on the lines indicated by Professor Moulton would go far towards re-establishing them as authentic works, and as being what they profess to be, viz. the utterances of Moses himself and the prophetic record of one whose place in history is assured (2 Kings xiv. 25). We should be glad to see this side of the literary study of the Bible more fully worked out.

Light from the East; or, the Witness of the Monuments. An Introduction to the Study of Biblical Archæology. By the Rev. C. J. BALL, M.A. (Oxon.), Chaplain to the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1899.)

THE publishers are to be congratulated upon the production of this large and handsome volume. It is beautifully printed and illustrated, and, until the appearance in the present year of the five large volumes setting forth the treasures of the British Museum, there was no such large and valuable collection in England of the monumental evidence for the historical truthfulness of the Bible as this work. With Mr. Ball as editor and Mr. W. H. Rylands as illustrator the publishers may well claim the credit of having issued 'the most comprehensive series of Biblical illustrations yet brought within the reach of the

English public,' and of having 'sought to make the work of equal value to the professed student as well as to the general reader.' There are thirty plates in colour, besides some three hundred other illustrations, and the value of the volume is further enhanced, not only by the editor's helpful letterpress, his remarks upon the relation of the Sumerian language to the Chinese, and his contributions from his own collection of treasures, but also by the indexes of subjects and Scripture references, the list of proper names, and the essay showing the relation of the Phœnician to the Hebrew letters (pp. 232-8). The contents of the volume may be summarized in this way, viz. (1) Mesopotamian documents; (2) documents bearing upon Israel's connexion with Egypt; (3) monuments of the Hittites; (4) Assyrian records; (5) the captivity of Judah—kingdom of Babylon; (6) Phœnician monuments. Of course, many of these inscriptions and illustrations have appeared before in other books, and the bearing of them upon Israelitish history has been set forth, e.g., by Professor Sayce and others; but there is in this volume 'a great amount of original matter,' which renders it specially valuable. Among Mr. Ball's own contributions we may mention a Babylonian seal of lapis-lazuli, exhibiting the worship of two eagle-headed deities (p. 151), a blue chalcedony mace-head from Babylon, *circa* B.C. 600 (p. 217), a Babylonian deed of sale—B.C. 518—of very great interest (pp. 229-30), and a small Egyptian seal of the twelfth dynasty (p. 255). It is almost impossible to do anything except praise such a work as this, since criticism is disarmed by such an effort to make the monuments tell their own tale, without prejudice; but perhaps the editor himself has given cause to one or two remarks upon the bearing of these records on what is called the 'Higher Criticism.' In his Preface he says:

'The present work is the fruit of an honest endeavour to furnish Bible students who are not versed in the languages of the ancient East with some of the chief results of recent Oriental research and discovery, so far as these are calculated to throw light on the text and meaning of Scripture. I have not approached my subject, nor handled my material, after the fashion of a professional Apologist. It has not been my direct aim to "confirm the Scriptures" by showing that they are in absolute agreement with all the available contemporary evidence. I do not believe that the Hebrew Scriptures stand in need of either apology or confirmation. My purpose has rather been to lead my readers to the right point of view for understanding them' (p. viii).

Mr. Ball is no doubt right in saying that 'the documents here brought forward afford ample proof of the general trustworthiness of Israelitish history;' but we could have wished that he had done a little more to bring out points of 'confirmation,' instead of giving a mass of marginal references to the texts of the inscriptions where the connexion was only slight, because the inference would be at first sight that the documents were contemporary with the Biblical passages referred to, whereas it is often far otherwise. And though the editor throughout adopts what may be called a neutral attitude in regard to the traditional or the critical view, there are not want-

ing
the
(p
rom
Tab
(pe
has
we
his

A

It
His
hast
retr
line
of h
into
edit
390

the
it is
seve
a m
boob
seen
fore,
circl
univ

their
do n
auth
But
whil
It is

rese
of th
repr
civil
soun
Free
chap
how
each

ing signs that his own sentiments are with the latter rather than the former. For example, a remark about the Book of Esther (p. 202) would imply that he is prepared to regard 'the story as a romance rather than a history,' and the exposition of the Sacrificial Tablet of Marseilles (pp. 247-55) in its bearing upon the contents (perhaps the date also) of Leviticus, make us think that the editor has at least a leaning towards the Higher Criticism. We hope that we have not done him an injustice, while we thank him heartily for his learned contributions to the book.

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. With Maps and Plans. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1900.)

It might perhaps be thought that there was no room for a new History of Greece. But such a view would be but a superficial and hasty one. As the great classical authors require to be re-edited and retranslated from time to time to bring the knowledge of them into line with the latest results of literary criticism, so it is with the study of history; and in the present case the work could not have fallen into better hands than those of the Greek Professor at Dublin, the editor of Gibbon and the historian of the later Roman Empire, A.D. 390-800.

The scope and general character of this history are described by the author in his preface, where he states his conviction (1) that 'while it is natural and certainly easier to allow such a work to range into several volumes, its compression into a single volume often produces a more useful book;' (2) that, 'so far as history is concerned, those books which are capable of enlisting the interest of mature readers seem to me to be best also for informing younger students. Therefore, while my aim is to help education, this book has in view a wider circle than those merely who are going through a course of school or university discipline' (p. v).

The great events with which we are so familiar must remain in their general outline the same, and the conclusions drawn from them do not often differ, or widely differ, from those drawn by the older authorities. The great landmarks of the subject are not altered. But while the action moves on through the same scenes we feel, while perusing Professor Bury's pages, that there is a subtle difference. It is the mode of treatment which constitutes its novelty.

The whole work is penetrated by the scientific spirit of modern research. Archaeology, epigraphy, numismatology, philology, each of these has contributed its share, and the result is a fresh and living representation of the evolution of one of the great factors in our civilization, lit up by the most recent discoveries and based on the soundest canons of historical study, as expounded in the school of Freeman and J. R. Green. Most histories of Greece open with a chapter on the physical configuration of the country, and point out how it naturally became the home of mountaineers and mariners, each petty community, nestled among its own rocks, being a separate

unit, and necessitating the invention of such a word as *interpolitical* to denote its transactions with its neighbours; while the adaptability of the land to maritime life is no less obvious, owing to the remarkable indentations of its coast line, its numerous bays, harbours, and islands. Professor Bury brings out well an additional point, which we do not remember to have seen hitherto noticed, where he illustrates from the geology of the Pliocene period the position of Greece in regard to Africa.

'Western Europe,' he says, 'and Western Africa were once united by bridges of continuous land, in the days when Sahara was a sea; and this ancient continent, which we might call *Europo-Libya*, was perhaps inhabited by peoples of homogeneous race, who were severed from one another when the ocean was let in and the Mediterranean assumed its present shape. Sicily, a remnant of the old land-bridge, has always been for Italy a step to, or a step from, Africa; while Spain needs no island to bridge her strait. It is uncertain whether there was also another bridge connecting the Greek Peninsula and Crete with the Libyan coast; but Crete at all events seems marked out to be a stepping-stone for Greece, as Sicily for Italy. Now in prehistoric ages there was a lively intercourse between the *Ægean* and *Libya*, and Crete served this purpose; but in historic times the eastern peninsula was not drawn by the same necessity, as the two western, into contact with the opposite continent' (p. 4).

The author has incorporated in his pages all the aids furnished by the explorations and excavations carried out on the mainland and in the islands during the last twenty or thirty years. This is seen at the outset in his treatment of the first faint beginnings of our knowledge of prehistoric Greece. Professor Bury is careful to speak in his preface cautiously and guardedly on the want of certainty that still attaches to the solution of many of the problems here met with. 'Fresh evidence,' he says, 'may at any hour upset tentative conclusions and force us to seek new interpretations of the data. The excavations which are now to be undertaken in Crete, at last restored to its own Greek world, may lead to unexpected results that may transform the whole question.' A writer of a book like this, where discussion is out of place, 'can only describe the main features of the culture which excavation has revealed, and state with implied reserve the chief general conclusions, which he considers probable.' 'He must leave much vague and indefinite' (p. vi). As the mists clear off in part from those dim ages some definite points emerge into view. Before the coming of the Greeks we are able to distinguish between an earlier and a later *Ægean* civilization, the former of which is assigned to the third, the latter to the second millennium B.C.

The earlier one belongs to the stone and copper age; there is an almost total absence of bronze implements. It is marked by obsidian products at Melos, and white jade found in the oldest settlement of all at Troy. Here we must take exception to the remark that an axe-head of white nephrite 'seems to show that in those remote days there was a line of traffic, however slow and uncertain, between China (!) and the Mediterranean; for this white jade has been found

only in China.' That this is an imperfect induction, based on a solitary and insufficient instance, the writer seems himself half conscious, for he says, in a note on the text at the end of the volume, that the circumstance that unexpected beds of jade have been recently found in the Alps must encourage us to be cautious in admitting such inferences as certain (p. 852).

Another very interesting outcome of this earliest Ægean civilization is connected with the ultimate origin of the Greek alphabet. Our author illustrates his statement that the Cretans may lay claim to having invented the first method of writing ever practised in Europe by a facsimile of a table of offerings, with an inscription, found in the Dictæan Cave. And now still further light is thrown on this subject by the paper recently read by Mr. Arthur Evans at the meeting of the British Association at Bradford. In his excavations of the prehistoric palace at Knossos he came upon a series of clay tablets with inscriptions. He gives reasons for thinking it highly probable either that the Phœnician letters (whence the Greek alphabet was derived) were actually selected from the Cretan characters in these archives, or that they point to at least a generic connexion.

The later Ægean civilization, placed in the second millennium B.C., is treated, as one might expect, much more fully by Professor Bury, and is illustrated by no less than twenty figures and plans. We can but indicate here its salient features, the greatness of Tiryns and Mycenæ and Troy, the intercourse with Egypt, with Crete, and Cyprus, and also the trade with the far west, the tin-fields of Spain and Britain. Its chronology rests on the evidence derived from metals. It was mainly an age of bronze. Iron was as yet rare and precious. Other marks by which we roughly fix its periods are given us (*a*) in porcelain ware, and scarabs of Amenhotep III. (c. 1400 B.C.), found at Mycenæ and Rhodes; (*b*) in the shaft tombs vertically cut in the rocks at Mycenæ, which were succeeded by the round vaulted tombs, of which the largest used to be falsely called the 'Treasury of Atreus'; (*c*) in the pottery, according as it is crude and unglazed, or glazed and varnished.

Such are the chief clues for determining the chronicles of the primitive civilization.

It is unnecessary to follow our author in detail through the succeeding chapters. The mighty drama unfolds itself in the well-known stages. After tracing the beginnings of Greek civilization in the Ægean from the pre-Homeric and Homeric ages, we see the emergence of the republics on the fall of the early monarchies, the expansion of Greece by colonization, begun in the eighth and completed in the sixth century, and ranging from the coasts of the Euxine and Asia Minor to the Western Mediterranean; the evolution of the two great types of Greek character and government, the Athenian and Spartan, with their temporary and partial union to resist the shock of the Persian invasion, their subsequent twenty-seven years' struggle ending in the fall of Athens and the supremacy of Sparta, who shows herself unfit for empire. There remain the restored Democracy of the Athenians, the Hegemony of Thebes, the rise of Macedonia, the

conquests of Alexander in the Far East, and his lofty conception of an empire, indifferent to the old petty distinction of Greek and Barbarian, and preparing the ground for the spread of a universal religion (pp. 786-821).

The great personages of Greek history are brought vividly before us in these pages. The following description of Pericles's political position may be quoted as a specimen of Professor Bury's style:—

'He believed in himself; and he sought to raise the people to his own wisdom, he would not stoop to their folly. The desire of autocratic authority was doubtless part of his nature; but his spirit was fine enough to feel that it was a greater thing to be leader of freemen whom he must convince by speech than despot of subjects who must obey his nod. Yet this leader of democracy was disdainful of the vulgar herd; and perhaps no one knew more exactly than he the weak points in a democratic constitution. . . .

'Pericles was a man of finer fibre than Themistocles, but he was not, like Themistocles, a statesman of originaive genius. He originated little; he elaborated the ideas of others. He brought to perfection the sovereignty of the people, which had been fully established in principle long ago; he raised to its height the empire which had been already founded. As an orator he may have had true genius; of that we cannot judge. It was his privilege to guide the policy of his country at a time when she had poets and artists who stand alone and eminent, not only in her own annals and those of Greece, but in the history of mankind. The Periclean age, the age of Sophocles and Euripides, Ictinus and Phidias, was not made by Pericles. But Pericles, though not creative, was one of the most interesting figures' (p. 382).

We regret that space forbids our giving also the character portrait of Brasidas, 'a Spartan by mistake' (p. 445).

Professor Bury takes an independent view of Greek history. He differs from Grote on more than one point, objecting, for instance, to the term 'the age of the despots' as a misleading one. Tyranny was always with the Greeks. There was no age which was not liable to it. Again, he does not believe in the Pan-Hellenic schemes attributed to Pericles, or hold that Athens was led on by him to undertake the Peloponnesian war from designs of seriously-increasing her empire, but only to maintain her naval supremacy. In connexion with this we meet with some valuable remarks at a later period. The dream of Pericles that Athens should be the school of Greece was fulfilled, but not till she had lost her empire. Under the restored democracy of the fourth century she began to exert a decisive influence on Greek thought and civilization. She then began to become even something more than Hellenic. 'The citizen of Athens has become a citizen of the world' (p. 575).

In the matter of size and general arrangement this history is a great improvement on its predecessors. The volume is shapely, and, though containing some nine hundred pages, is not cumbersome. The broad page, unbroken by notes, with its running marginal analysis, is pleasant to the eye, while the chapters are divided into convenient sections, each with its proper heading.

The copious illustrations from vases, inscriptions, coins, and

oth
not
tou
(p.
the
seri
and
sth
rea
of t
of M
divi
seer
Oxf
ritie
Free

fess
of a
publ
attra
inst
apt t
days
Dr.
he le
with
diffic
matur
the n

W
schol
predi
on G

The

a

THES
After
Holy
a simi
an acc
the m
to the
Baptis
shown
our L
actual
In

other branches of historical investigation of the present day form a noteworthy feature of the book; among them is a particularly touching figure of the 'Mourning' Athena in the Acropolis Museum (p. 406). She is bending over a *stèle*, and supposed to be reading the names of citizens slain early in the Peloponnesian war. The series of remarkable portrait heads and busts, *e.g.* those of Cimon and Pericles, of Socrates and Thucydides, of Alexander and Demosthenes, deserve special commendation as bringing vividly before the reader the personality of the great actors in the story. At the end of the volume are full chronological tables and a valuable Appendix of Notes, giving the sources of historical matter in the text, carefully divided under the heads of primary and derivative; so that it would seem impossible to repeat the ludicrous answer once made by an Oxford examinee, who, on being asked what were the original authorities for the period he had taken up, replied, 'Dr. Stubbs and Mr. Freeman'!

A more helpful guide or a more stimulating present than Professor Bury's work we can hardly imagine for a beginner in the study of ancient history. It is a great thing for the higher forms of the public schools to have the subject brought before them in such an attractive garb, and compressed within the limits of a single volume, instead of being spread over many, like those of Grote, which are apt to daunt and deter by their length; for it is very few in these days who are capable in their youth of such extended reading as Dr. Arnold, who went through Gibbon and Mitford twice over before he left school. The candidate for University honours will here meet with much valuable and suggestive aid towards attacking the more difficult questions with which he will have to cope; while the maturer student will gladly avail himself of the references given in the notes to the more recent foreign literature on the subject.

We congratulate Professor Bury on the completion of this scholarly and highly interesting volume. It is scarcely hazardous to predict that for a long time to come it will remain the standard work on Greek history.

The Catholic and Apostolic Church. Letters to his Son. By ROUNDELL, FIRST EARL OF SELBORNE. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899.)

THESE clear and helpful letters deal with the subject of the Church. After a brief introduction there is a full statement of the teaching of Holy Scripture about the Kingdom of Heaven. This is followed by a similar statement about the 'Ecclesia,' or Church. There is then an account of what is to be found in Holy Scripture with regard to the ministry and organization of the Church, with slight additions as to the evidence from Christian antiquity. The institutions of Holy Baptism and the Holy Communion are similarly treated. It is then shown that evils and divisions in the Church were anticipated by our Lord, and some account is given of the divisions which have actually taken place in ancient and modern times.

In noticing this book there is little for a reviewer to do other

than to point out that it is likely to be of very great value to intelligent and cultivated people of no special learning as supplying a clear and accurate statement of what is really to be found in Holy Scripture on the points with which it deals; to refer to some passages which seem to be specially admirable; and to offer one or two slight criticisms with that deference which is due to the great ability and high character of the first Earl of Selborne.

Among the passages which seem to us to be of special excellence is a description of the office of the Church as the guardian of the deposit of the faith. At the end of the chapter entitled 'The "Ecclesia," or "Church,"' it is said:

'The Church, being instituted (among its other ends) as the depositary, guardian, and witness, from generation to generation, of such a chain of historical testimony to the original facts and doctrines of Christianity, must necessarily bear its witness in conformity with this universal law. Our Lord's own mission and office, and the truth of His teaching and of His Divine Nature and Incarnation, were attested by supernatural Revelations, by fulfilments of Prophecy, by His own miraculous works, by the consistency and perfection of His life and doctrine, and finally by His Resurrection from the dead and Ascension into Heaven. The Apostles who recorded the facts which constituted this testimony did so as witnesses of the things which they had themselves seen and heard; and the other Evangelists and St. Paul, so far as they did not write from direct personal knowledge, certainly did so as companions of those who had been with Christ, and as having received from them what *they* taught.¹ The same deposit of faith was handed on to their disciples, and was committed by them, "before many witnesses," to those who were, in their turn, to commit it to other "faithful men," who should "be able to teach others also." From generation to generation, since their time, the same process has been continued; and those who believe Christ's promise, that He will be with His Apostles "always, even unto the end of the world," cannot doubt that it will so continue to the end. A corporate institution like the Church is both an organized community of witnesses, and itself a historical record or monument. . . . The testimony of the Church is the ground of the reception of those books [*i.e.* the books of the New Testament] as inspired records by the original teachers of Christianity, of the facts and doctrines on which the Christian Faith is founded, and of the manner and form in which that Faith was from the beginning authoritatively taught' (pp. 41-3, 45).

Other passages which have struck us as specially useful are those on the right interpretation of Hebrews vi. 4-6 as not denying the possibility of mercy 'even after total and wilful apostacy,' but as teaching that there cannot be a second gift of baptismal regeneration (pp. 95-6); the causes of the division between the East and the West (pp. 129-31); the need of patience under present divisions (pp. 133-5); and the identity of the present Church of England with the pre-Reformation English Church. On the last point the Earl of Selborne writes:

¹ With regard to St. Paul, references are here given to Acts ix. 27-8; I Cor. xv. 3-7. It would have been well to refer also to Gal. i. 12, ii. 6, where St. Paul asserts his independence, so far as knowledge of the truth is concerned, of the other Apostles.

'The Church of England, therefore (unless the charge of departure from the faith can justly be brought against her, on which point she has always appealed, and may safely appeal, to the text of the Scriptures and of the earliest Christian antiquity), is in this country the same Body, if tried by any of the historical tests of organic and corporate identity, as at the time when Christianity was first planted here. No mere variations in the forms of worship and mutable accidents of a Church can make any difference in this respect. We do not, on account of any such variations, doubt the identity (in the sense now in question) of the present Roman Church with the Roman Church of the second or any later century, or of the present Greek Church with that which existed in Greece in the time of St. Paul. Nor do variations of doctrine or practice, more pure at one time, at another more corrupted, and again at another time purified and reformed, affect (in this sense) the identity of a church' (pp. 132-3).

There are, as we have said, a very few points on which we wish to make respectful criticisms. We always feel doubtful as to the soundness of the interpretation here adopted which explains 'the daily ministration' and the serving of 'tables' of Acts vi. 1-2 as 'the administration and distribution of the consecrated sacramental elements, and the other ordinary offices of Christian worship' (p. 54). We regret that a note has not been added to the statement on the reopening of 'questions (formerly supposed to have been settled by Bishop Pearson) as to much of the received text' of the writings of St. Ignatius (p. 64) to call attention to the fact that the magnificent work of Bishop Lightfoot¹ has shown conclusively that the seven Epistles are all genuine. The pages about the real presence in the Eucharist (pp. 101-8) seem to us a little open to misunderstanding. With the statement that the Church of England has not retained 'the primitive custom of mixing water with the wine' in 'the Eucharistic service' (p. 111) we are compelled to join issue, and must point out that it was said by the late Archbishop Benson in his judgment in the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln:

'No rule has been made to "change or abolish" the all but universal use of a mixed cup from the beginning. When it was desirable to modify the direction as to the uniform use of unleavened wafers, a Rubric was enacted declaring Wheat Bread sufficient. Without order it seems that no person had a right to change the matter in the chalice any more than to change the form of bread. Wine alone may have been adopted by general habit but not by law.'²

That is, whatever clergymen of the Church of England may have done, the Church of England herself has retained 'the primitive custom of mixing water with the wine' in 'the Eucharistic service.'

The paper and printing of the book are of high excellence. The misprints *κεκωντηρισμένων* (p. 119) and 'Vincent of Levias' (p. 136) have caught our eye.

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii.

² In the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Read and others v. the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, Judgment, p. 13.

Oxford Church Text Books. The Hebrew Prophets. By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, M.A., Rector of Winterbourne Bassett, formerly Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, and Bampton Lecturer. (London: Rivingtons, 1898.)

THIS handy little book is written with the clearness and good taste which habitually mark Mr. Ottley's work, and it contains much useful information in a short form. We are unable, however, to commend it. The point of view from which it is written pervades it throughout, and spoils what otherwise might be valuable. What the point of view is will be guessed by those who are acquainted with Mr. Ottley's Bampton Lectures, and may be seen from the apparent suggestion that the date of the 'law book' 'discovered in the temple by the priest Hilkiah,' which 'seems to have consisted of the greater portion of the Book of Deuteronomy,' is not earlier than the eighth century B.C. (p. 53), and the ascription of a large part of the Book of Isaiah to the sixth century B.C. (pp. 71-2; cf. pp. 2-4), of Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. to about 330 B.C. (p. 99), of the Book of Jonah to the fifth or fourth century B.C. (p. 101), and of the Book of Daniel to 165 or 164 B.C. (p. 104).

We can only regret that the publishers and the able editor of this series entrusted this important volume to Mr. Ottley's hands.

A First Book on the Bible. By the late T. P. GARNIER, M.A., Rector of Banham, Norfolk, Hon. Canon of Norwich Cathedral, Author of *A First Book on the Church*, &c. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1899).

THIS is a useful little book intended to answer questions about the origin, history, and authority of the Bible. Besides the preface and introductory and concluding chapters it deals with the 'witness' of 'the Holy Bible' 'to itself'; 'the writing of the New Testament'; 'the settlement of the canon'; 'the Faith and the Bible'; the 'relation' of 'the Old and New Testaments' 'to each other'; the 'inspiration of the Bible'; 'the interpretation of Holy Scripture'; 'the devotional use of Holy Scripture'; and 'the Apocrypha.' On all these subjects it gives much information in a clear and accurate form. The author, we observe, follows the Bishop of Durham, as in much else, in asserting the existence of an 'Oral Gospel' as the precursor of the written Gospels (pp. 16, 30). He seems to us to underestimate the difficulty of the problems presented by the history of the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament (pp. 139-48). In what he says about the possibly 'allegorical form' of the account of the Fall (pp. 106-7) it would have been well, in view of much which has been written of late years, to be more careful to safeguard the historical character of the narrative; and he makes a mistake in his reference to St. Paul's teaching about Isaac and Ishmael in the Epistle to the Galatians.¹ What St. Paul there says is not that the account of the two sons of Abraham is 'allegorical rather than

¹ Gal. iv. 22-4.

literal,' as would be required by the way in which Mr. Garnier refers to it (pp. 106-7); but that, being in the first instance literal, it has also a further spiritual meaning.¹

The office of the Church, as giving and interpreting the Bible, is well brought out; and the whole book is marked by a reverent tone. The sense of the value of Holy Scripture which pervades it may be illustrated from the following passage:

'If believers in such an inspiration of the Bible were to be called upon for proofs for their belief they could only make answer that they had found it to be so, that it had done for them what no other book had ever done, that it spake as never book spake. It had shown them the great essential truths which had made their life, with all its many trials and perplexities, not merely endurable but intelligible, and illumined it with a great glow of hope, towards which they pressed. They no longer shrink from the Supreme Being, with His unutterable holiness. They believe in the great deliverance wrought by His Son, and in the possibility of an ultimate victory over sin, and man's complete restoration to the Presence of God. Such great truths may be only dimly and imperfectly apprehended as yet, but they are apprehended in their measure, and they constitute the life of their life. What would many a waning life be without the old frayed Bible by the bedside? What would the day be in many a humble home without that hour when what is pre-eminently "the Volume of the Book" is reached down from its place upon the shelf to be read in the hearing of that household? It supplies what nothing else has ever been able to supply. It gives light to all that are in the house. And this testimony of the individual soul is the testimony of thousands and tens of thousands in every generation. It is a fact to be reckoned with, this great cloud of witnesses who have heard God speaking to them out of the pages of the Bible. The Book is proved to be Divine by demonstration of the Spirit and of power' (pp. 108-9).

How much is left of the Old Doctrines? A Book for the People.

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN. (London: James Clarke and Co., not dated.)

THE explanation of the title of this book is that the author has attempted to produce a statement in a popular form of that residue of Christianity which would remain when allowances have been made for what he regards as the conclusions of modern science, philosophy, and thought in general.

We can understand that a book with this end in view might have some utility. A clear positive statement of what was still left when what the particular writer deemed to be excrescences no longer tenable had been stripped off would be of service so far as there remained what was true, however scanty it might be. And such a statement might even be of spiritual value to some soul vexed by doubt and perplexity which might be helped by laying hold of the remnants of the Christian faith.

It is far otherwise with such a rhetorical and misleading production as the book before us. What is prominent is not the affirmation of positive truth, however scanty, but the denial of traditional doc-

¹ See Bright, *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, p. 233.

trines which are first misrepresented and then declared to be immoral. It is a work likely, not to preserve the few fragments of belief which can be kept by a puzzled soul, but to increase the perplexity of those who are already in doubt, and, it may be, to bring it to some who have hitherto been free from it.

At a very early point in the book Dr. Gladden quotes with apparent approval a statement that 'the divinity of Christ,' as well as 'the Trinity,' is one of the matters which 'we understand' 'differently from our fathers' (p. 5). This prepared us to find that 'what is left of the old doctrines' is little indeed. We are no longer to believe in a personal devil or in subordinate spirits of evil. The devil 'was not known nor imagined by any of the Hebrew prophets, kings, or lawgivers before the Babylonian exile.' After the exile 'the people' 'brought with them the germs of a demonology which mightily affected their own belief'; for they 'borrowed' 'the Dualism of the Persians and the Medians' (p. 87). 'In the New Testament times' 'the people of Judæa,' or 'the majority of them,' 'did believe in a great kingdom of evil spirits, with Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, as its ruler'; and our Lord 'did not antagonize' this belief, 'but accommodated His teachings to it' (pp. 108-9). Nevertheless it 'conflicts with' the 'conception of the Heavenly Father and His kingdom on the earth,' and therefore Dr. Gladden 'can find no room for' it 'in' his 'theology' (p. 110). After this frank rejection of the teaching of Him who is Almighty God it is not surprising to meet with the chapter which denies original sin (pp. 112-32), or that which, at any rate, so far confuses the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as to make it cease to be recognizable as the Catholic truth (pp. 133-56), or the statement that 'the theological formula of two natures in one person conveys to' the 'mind' of the author 'no clear meaning' (p. 161), or the explanation which reduces the divinity of our Lord to the fact that

'in Him, for the first and only time in history, the Word of God found clear and perfect articulate expression. He was the ideal man, the consummation and the crown of humanity, and therefore He was the manifestation of God' (p. 173).

Nor is it to be wondered at that the Atonement is deprived of objective value (pp. 174-95); that the rite of Baptism is represented as simply declaring the fact that 'every child who is born into this world is God's child when he is born' (p. 254); and that in the Holy Communion 'precisely the same thing' is said to happen to us in relation to Christ as takes place 'when we are brought into living sympathy with any strong, wise, loving human spirit,' 'something of' whose 'strength and wisdom and love passes into our spirits and becomes part of ourselves'; 'precisely thus in our communion with the spiritual Christ do we become partakers of His life' (p. 278).

Dr. Gladden, dates his preface from the First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio, and is, we therefore assume, a Congregationalist minister. There was a time when the great Nonconformist

bodies held fast with faith and devotion to the central truths of Christianity. It is sad that at present so many of their pulpits should be used for the promulgation of theories which are even less orthodox than the older forms of Unitarianism.

Prayers Public and Private. Being Orders and Forms of Public Services, Private Devotions, and Hymns, compiled, written, or translated. By the Most Rev. EDWARD WHITE BENSON, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. Edited by the Rev. HUGH BENSON. (London: Isbister and Co., Limited, 1899.)

A CONSIDERABLE part of this volume consists of 'Orders and Forms of Public Services' of various kinds. Among them are the Form for admitting a chorister at Lincoln Minster, the Form and Order for laying the Foundation Stone of Truro Cathedral, Prayers used at the dedication of Churches, the Form and Order of the Opening of the Church House, a Festal Service for Christmas Eve, consisting of Nine Lessons with Carols, a Prayer during the epidemic of influenza in 1892, the Thanksgiving for the Duchess of York's safe delivery of a son, and a Prayer for the Royal National Lifeboat Institution.

More interesting than these are the Private Devotions. They are too sacred for a reviewer to write of them at length. But we may say that there are many prayers, most of them in Greek or Latin, some ancient and some original, of great pathos and beauty which the Archbishop appears to have used habitually, and add that there must be few persons who would not be benefited even by merely reading them through. In all cases there are translations attached, the work either of the Archbishop himself or of the editor of the book.

The hymns include translations of *Dies irae*, *Verbum supernum prodiens*, both parts of *Urbs beata*, *Te lucis ante terminum*, and *O luce qui mortalibus*, and some original hymns.

It is of interest to notice that the collection of private devotions contains explicit prayers for the departed. One of the prayers said privately by the Archbishop after the recital of the Office was:

'Yea, Lord, and give rest to my Martin¹ in a place of light where he may behold the light of Thy countenance, where sorrow and sighing is fled away' (p. 169).

In the prayer said privately after the Consecration in the Holy Communion the following occurs:

'Remember also N. Thy servant, who hath gone before us with the sign of faith and sleeps the sleep of peace. To him, O Lord, with all that rest in Christ, give place of refreshment, light, and peace, where the brightness of Thy countenance is lifted up on them, and sorrow and sighing are fled away' (p. 175).

And in the private prayer recited daily by the Archbishop 'as Prebendary of Heydour cum Walton in the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Lincoln' it is said:

¹ His eldest son, who died in 1877.

'Almighty Everlasting God, who art Lord both of the living and of the dead, and pitiest all those whom Thou dost foreknow to be Thine by faith and works : we humbly beseech Thee that those for whom we have determined to offer our prayers, both those whom this world yet holdeth in the flesh, and those already unclothed of the body, whom the world to come hath received, may by Thy goodness and mercy be counted worthy to attain pardon of all their sins, and eternal joys, through our Lord' (p. 223).

The editor's work has been admirably done ; and he is certainly right in saying that 'there will be found in' the book 'the unity of a mind that was inspired by intense private devotion, guided and restrained by the true liturgical spirit' (Preface, p. 7).

The Unity of the Book of Isaiah. Linguistic and other Evidence of the Undivided Authorship. By LETITIA D. JEFFREYS. With a Preface by the Rev. R. SINKER, D.D. (Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1899.)

THIS is a very modest but an extremely valuable book. It exhibits signs of patient and careful work at the Hebrew text of the Book of Isaiah. It supplies a very large number of very significant instances of phraseology used in the different parts of the Book. The tables thus given will naturally be of most value to those who have at any rate some slight knowledge of Hebrew. As the words are translated into English the book can easily be used by, and will be very serviceable to, those who are acquainted only with the English text. It is much to be hoped that those students of Holy Scripture who read the books by Dr. Driver and others maintaining that the work of more authors than one is combined in the Book of Isaiah will study also this short and interesting volume, giving weighty reasons for adhering to the traditional view. In the 'author's preface' Mrs. Jeffreys mentions the help and encouragement she has received from Professor Margoliouth, Dr. Bernstein, and Dr. Valpy French, as well as from Dr. Sinker, the learned librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, who contributes a preface from which we make the following extracts :

'Curiously diverse . . . is the character of the conflicting evidence. On the one hand we have the unity of the book handed down by an unbroken and unchallenged tradition till the last century. Those who maintain that we have two or more hands at work have to show how a prophet, or prophets, of so surpassing power, could have been an unknown name to the generations which saw the editing of the second volume of the Hebrew Bible; and why, even if the name were unknown, the prophecy should tacitly have been joined on to the writing of a much earlier prophet.

'The arguments used on the other side, whatever force may be allowed to them, are not sufficient answers to the above. Roughly put, they fall into three sets. The "historical background" of cc. xl-lxvi is said not to be Palestinian, as it ought to be. But then some critics call the background Babylonian, and some call it Egyptian; so that this argument may be left alone till adverse criticism has settled what its own conclusion certainly is.

'Then too it is maintained that the "theological background" is different in the earlier and latter part of Isaiah. This means little more than that certain topics are specially dwelt on in the former and certain others in the latter. It is as though the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians could not be the same as the author of the Epistle to the Romans, since the doctrine of justification by faith was no longer the all-engrossing topic. Is even a mere human writer not to be free to change his ground as he needs? How much less may we rule that the Inspiring Spirit sees only with our eyes?

'There remains the argument drawn from alleged differences of vocabulary and style. This argument has always seemed to me a precarious one: a writer's style varies as time goes on, varies all the more in proportion to the influence of external events' (pp. viii-ix).

'The problem is whether the style of the later chapters is so different that it is inconceivable that they should have come from the hand which penned the earlier chapters. It is this last point to which the writer of the present little work mainly addresses herself. Although, as I have said above, I think that the linguistic evidence in such matters is *per se* somewhat precarious, still it cannot be doubted that, in a matter of such exceptional importance, every individual point should be carefully weighed and tested. That a great amount of linguistic evidence can be adduced hostile to the unity of the book is undoubted. It has been the author's endeavour to show that there are also numerous links connecting the two parts. Clearly of course all these are not of equal value, nor will they appeal with equal force to all minds. They evince, however, much patient and minute study of the Hebrew, and the labour of love has evidently grudged no pains which could ensure accuracy' (p. x).

Certainly, as Dr. Sinker says, the matter is of 'exceptional importance'; and we offer our sincere and cordial thanks to Mrs. Jeffreys for her valuable work in defence of what we believe to be the truth of the unity of the Book of Isaiah.

Church Eclectic Reprints. The Doctrine of the Laying-on of Hands.

By the Right Rev. HOLLINGWORTH TULLY KINGDON, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Fredericton. I. 'The Promise of the Father.' II. 'The Two Modes of Giving the Gift.' III. 'The Wedding Garment.' (New York: James Pott and Co., not dated.)

THESE three papers by the Bishop of Fredericton have been reprinted from the American periodical the *Church Eclectic*. The first paper raises the question when the promise of the Gift of the Holy Ghost was made. Bishop Kingdon points out that our Lord's words 'the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of Me' seem 'to refer to the oft-repeated promise in the long discourse or series of discourses at the Last Supper, recorded afterwards in St. John's Gospel.' He then calls attention to the fact that 'our Lord does not say that He initiated the promise' and that it seems to be implied that 'the promise had been given before and was then renewed or confirmed.' He finds an earlier reference to the promised Gift in our Lord's words to the woman of Samaria, 'if thou knewest the gift of God,' and in that saying of our Lord on which St. John comments, 'This spake He of the Spirit.' He shows reason for thinking that this promise of the Spirit was 'dimly intimated in the blessing upon

Abraham,' and that a foundation was thus laid for the prophecy of Joel, 'I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh,' and the utterances of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. At the end of the paper he mentions the fact that the fulfilment of the promise was bestowed upon the 'firstfruits of Jew and Gentile,' 'without the intervention of any ministerial agency,' but 'from that time forward, to Jew and Gentile' 'by the laying-on of hands, after prayer, by ministerial agency.'

The second paper carefully distinguishes between the phraseology used by St. Luke in describing the 'particular and peculiar' outpouring of the Holy Ghost which was bestowed on the 'firstfruits of Jew and Gentile' 'without the intervention of any ministerial agency,' and that in the same writer in connexion with the 'general' gift of the Holy Ghost 'by ministerial agency.' The Bishop points out that the terms the Holy Ghost was 'poured out' (*ἐκέχυται*),¹ or that God 'shed Him forth' (*ἐξέχεε*),² or that He 'fell' (*ἐπιπεπρωκός* or *ἐπέπεσε*),³ are confined to the instance of the 'peculiar' outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the 'firstfruits of Jew and Gentile.'

'On the Day of Pentecost there had been no specially accredited ministers to convey the Gift: the Father had not yet said to the servants, "Bring forth the *first* robe and put it on him." Therefore, it may be said, humanly speaking, that it was a necessary consequence that the Gift should be *poured out* directly from on high. But the case was different with Cornelius: St. Peter was there; some time before St. Peter had been the means whereby "the Holy Ghost was given"; he would naturally expect that, as he had been sent for especially in consequence of a message from God, and that [*sic*] he had been especially warned of God to go, his presence would be required for the admittance of Cornelius to full Christian privileges.

'But Cornelius and his friends were the firstfruits of the Gentile world. . . . The Hebrew Christians had to learn that henceforward there was to be no difference between Jew and Gentile, and to emphasize this, and to make it apparent beyond controversy, the firstfruits of the Gentile world were vouchsafed the same great privilege, bestowed in precisely the same manner as the firstfruits of the Jewish Church had received it.'

The third paper is on the three parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, and the Marriage of the King's Son. Bishop Kingdon calls attention to the place occupied in each parable by a robe or garment. In the parable of the Good Samaritan the wounded traveller was stripped of his raiment. In the parable of the Prodigal Son the 'first robe,' 'the robe he wore when he was a loved son in his father's house,' was restored on his repentance to the son who had sinned. In the third parable the man who had not on a wedding garment was cast into outer darkness.

'Here then we see the series. First man turned away from God, and is at once "stripped of his raiment," and the last we hear of him is that he is left "half dead" in the inn. Then the man, having voluntarily left home, is enabled, when starving, "wretched and miserable, and poor and blind and naked," to turn back again to home, when he is welcomed by his father, who at once bids his *servants* "Bring forth the *first* robe

¹ Acts x. 45.

² Acts ii. 33.

³ Acts viii. 16, x. 44, xi. 15.

and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand"; and he is admitted to a great feast of rejoicing, to which the elder refuses to come. The robe is now restored to him; and the last parable teaches the extreme importance of the robe, which may be had for the asking, but may be lost again or refused. "Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments."

The Bishop then points out that in Holy Scripture 'stress is laid upon' the 'especial punishment' of 'sin' in 'the manifestation of our shame in nakedness.' Adam possessed the 'supernatural endowment' of 'the inward presence of the Holy Spirit.' The sense of nakedness produced by the Fall was the stripping off of this 'robe of the soul,' which 'was lost in Adam and is restored in Christ.' Thus the three parables represent the life of the soul from Adam to the Day of Judgment. That of the Good Samaritan 'covers the time from the Fall of man till the Ascension of the Lord into heaven.' That of the Prodigal Son 'covers the period from the Lord's Ascension till the Last Day.' That of the Marriage Feast is a picture of 'the future sifting and discrimination.' The 'first robe,' 'lost in Adam and' 'restored in Christ,' and the wedding garment alike denote the Gift of the Holy Ghost.

'St. Irenæus says distinctly that the Holy Ghost is the wedding garment, and that those who have been called to the supper and have not the Holy Ghost will be cast out into outer darkness.

'Thus we may trace in parabolic symbolism the teaching about the laying-on of hands. In this life "the Father saith to His servants," the Bishops, "Bring forth the first robe and put it on him." Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.'

We hope that very many of our readers will procure these remarkable papers and read them for themselves. They are worthy of the most careful study. Our regret about them is that they are issued in a form hardly calculated to call sufficient attention to them and their real merit. We hope the Bishop of Fredericton may see his way to publishing them in a method more likely to obtain for them a wide circulation.

Life and Remains of the Rev. R. H. Quick. Edited by F. STORR.
(Cambridge: University Press, 1899.)

'QUICK was not a teacher to the manner born as were his contemporaries Dr. Kennedy, Dean Bradley, Professor Bonamy Price, but he had faith in his high calling and profession which few of his generation shared, and by help of that faith "out of weakness he was made strong." Painfully conscious of his own shortcomings, recording and analyzing them in the hope that they might serve as stepping-stones to future generations of teachers, too clear-sighted to be imposed upon by conventionalities, too sanguine of the possible attainments of training and culture to acquiesce in the traditional routine and respectable conservatism of English public schools, and too honest and fearless to conceal his discontent, he was naturally no prophet in his own country, but he has won a lasting place among "educational reformers," and can safely appeal to the verdict of posterity from the half-patronizing, half-contemptuous estimate of his practical colleagues, who regarded him as an amiable but ineffectual dreamer' (p. 61).

With this appreciative estimate of Mr. Quick by the editor of his remains those who read the memoir and the extracts from his note-books which follow it will probably agree. One feels that Quick was an idealist, and one has to judge of him accordingly, but one must not judge of him by his career, for that is disappointing; rather, one must try to read his thoughts and observe his principles, and then one realizes what a wonderful man he was, and how he has left his mark upon education without being himself a model teacher. As Mr. Storr says in his short preface, 'Quick held and still holds' a position 'both as a striking personality and as an educational expert' (p. v). Other testimonies to his merits are to be found in plenty within this volume, of which we give two or three. For example, (1) Mr. Llewelyn Davies, whose curate R. H. Quick once was, says, 'I never knew a man more unworldly, more simple, more quietly indifferent to money or to praise' (p. 9). (2) Dr. H. M. Butler, under whom he worked at Harrow, writes, 'Pedantry and Quick had no point of contact. Anything pedantic was out of place, and, we may hope, out of countenance, in his presence.' 'There was one region of the earth in which he reigned supreme, and that was the nursery floor or the drawing-room rug.' 'In truth he dearly loved young children' (pp. 62, 63). (3) A Harrow colleague, Mr. G. H. Hallam, adds, 'He was the most faithful, the most unselfish, the most sympathetic of friends,' and yet among the boys he gained the nickname of 'Old Fireworks,' because he would fire up with indignation at anything which savoured 'of *ὕβρις* or brutality or injustice' (p. 117). Mr. Storr has done his task well and sympathetically; he has read through forty note-books which were 'at once a Diary and an Adversaria' (p. v), finding in them 'hardly a dull page,' and he has managed to condense his memoir into 115 pages, adding only some obituary notices which appeared in the *Journal of Education*. The remainder of the volume consists of extracts from the said note-books upon subjects connected with education, both elementary and higher grade, the training of teachers, the study of child nature, and the relation of boys and masters in public schools, besides various other points of interest. These extracts occupy about 400 pages, and there is a good index. We have enjoyed the book thoroughly, and may say, as Mr. Storr said of the note-books, 'There is hardly a dull page in it.' We have said above that Mr. Quick's own 'career' was 'disappointing'; and we think that the following summary of his life will prove it, while it does not touch the acknowledged ability, courage, and conscientiousness of the man, nor the personal regard in which he was held by all who worked with him or came under his influence.

Robert Herbert Quick was born in 1831; was sent to Harrow in 1846, but only stayed one term, owing to poor health, and was put under private tutors until he went to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1850. Here he did not take up classics, because he could not do verses, but studied mathematics, which he disliked, and came out *senior optime* in the tripos of 1854. His taste was rather for modern languages, especially German, and literature rather than philology.

He
Wh
a m
poc
app
any
pre
Cra
all
mo
this
sec
me
fou
im
hir
the
Bu
of
H.
ba
tio
fin
by
of
Bi
Ha
his
nu
Te
ow
a s
no
Ye
ye
an
ar
th
wi
R
a
ex
(M
as
by

re
Se
su
w

He took holy orders, and worked with Mr. J. Ll. Davies both in Whitechapel and Marylebone (1855-6 and 1857-8), where he made a mark by his sermons, his musical taste, and his sympathy with the poor. After this he went to school work, and here his record is disappointing; for he could not settle down for any length of time in any one post, the longest stay being at Harrow (1869-74); he had previously tried Lancaster, Guildford, Hurstpierpoint (twice), and Cranleigh, besides paying two visits to Germany to learn the language, all within ten years (1858-68). Sometimes he remained a few months only at a school, and then went off to something else. Within this period he wrote his work on *Educational Reformers* (1868), the second edition of which appeared in 1887, and was highly commended by Professor J. R. Seeley (p. 124). At Hurstpierpoint he found the chapel a great help; at Cranleigh he made a happy impression on his pupils, one of whom speaks with enthusiasm of him in the games, and recalls 'the cheery voice, the kind eager face, the long growth of red beard,' and his singing in chapel (pp. 20-1). But Quick will probably be judged by his record at Harrow, where of all places he ought to have felt at home with his 'lifelong friend' H. M. Butler, but his expectations were unfulfilled; his health was bad, he could not stand the incessant 'grind,' he was over-conscientious about his lessons; he complains of the burden of the 'exercises,' finds discipline difficult; is pained by the 'want of interest' shown by his pupils, their 'indifference to learning'; he dislikes the worship of athletics; finds 'routine' irksome; he is dissatisfied with the Bible lessons, dreads preaching, has a horror of 'cribs.' On leaving Harrow (1874) he purposed to start a preparatory school, and after his marriage he secured a school in Bayswater, where at once the numbers went down. In 1879-80 he lectured at Cambridge for the Teachers' Training Syndicate upon the history of Education, but his own account of the lectures is very disappointing. Then he started a school at Guildford, which was an entire failure, because he had no system in his teaching. In 1883 he accepted the living of Sedburgh, Yorkshire, offered him by his old college, and held it for about four years; and there, from what we know of him, he ought to have found an acceptable sphere of work, for he loved the poor. But no! we are told, he was 'too ready to take offence,' and 'wanting in tact,' though when he left (in 1887) 'he and his parishioners . . . parted with mutual regret and goodwill' (p. 96). Quick then moved to Redhill, and there busied himself with literary work, and in forming a collection of books upon Education. Mr. Storr does not give the exact date of his death, but we infer that it occurred in 1891 (March 9), in the house of Professor Seeley at Cambridge (p. 126), as the *Journal of Education* for April 1 in that year contained notices by friends (p. 115).

We are unable to say more about R. H. Quick himself, but his remains will well repay study: he has much to say about Elementary Schools which more recent legislation (we are glad to say) has made superfluous, but his remarks about Public Schools strike us as somewhat one-sided. His views on religion were those of Maurice and

Kingsley, but he was sensibly affected by the High Church teaching which he found at Hurstpierpoint; and his notes upon the Harrow preparation for Confirmation (p. 55) show how much there was yet to be done there in the way of religious influence. Every one will endorse Mr. Quick's remarks upon Religious Teaching, where he says, 'One point is clear, that the first thing to cultivate in the young is reverence, and reverence is surely in danger if you take a class in "Religion" just as you take a class in Grammar.' 'Religious instruction may be conveyed in a most impressive way through the medium of worship' (p. 14). It is sad after this to read what he says about his own school, viz. The 'Harrow chapel never was of the smallest material advantage to me. It is weak and dwarfing' (p. 30), especially after telling us that at Cranleigh he missed the chapel of Hurstpierpoint (p. 29). It appears to us that three circumstances tended to mar the career of R. H. Quick, viz. (1) his imperfect bodily health, (2) his lack of public school training, (3) his loss of definite Church teaching; and may we not add that his possession of private means made him disinclined to face the discipline of one who is forced to work for his daily bread? Had he been obliged to do this he would not have been less powerful as 'an educational expert,' while at least he would have learned to exhibit in himself what he could so readily criticize in others. His own lack of discipline (pp. 41-2) made him often think disparagingly of the insistence upon it in Elementary Schools (pp. 128-37).

The Things beyond the Tomb. In a Catholic Light. By the Rev. T. H. PASSMORE, M.A. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, 1900.)

THE thoughts of English Churchmen are, we gladly notice, being increasingly directed towards the subject of this excellent little book. A long time of silence on the second stage of the life of man, and culpable neglect of the proper observance of Easter Eve, have resulted in the rise of all sorts of unscriptural fads about the state of man after death. So far as we could we have done our part in endeavouring to remedy this unhappy defect in English Christianity, and have not lost opportunities of insisting that the full teaching of the Prayer Book—in this instance in the Easter Eve services and in the Order for the Burial of the Dead—provides, as usual, the proper corrective of Roman distortions of the truth on the one hand, and Protestant omissions and vagaries on the other.¹

¹ See our articles on the Intermediate State in Nos. 24, 63; on Future Retribution, No. 52; on Hades and Gehenna, No. 42; on Prayers in the English Church for the Departed, No. 19; on Eternal Punishment, Nos. 8, 11, 21, 24 (p. 575); on Universalism, No. 5 (p. 247); on Bishop Dahle's *Life after Death* and other works, No. 91 (p. 249); on Dr. Mortimer's *Catholic Faith and Practice*, No. 95; to the works discussed in these articles may be added references to *Man and the Spiritual World*, just issued by the Rev. A. Chambers (London, Taylor), and to Dr. Liddon's sermon on the first five minutes after death in his *Advent Sermons*, ii. 68, and compare pp. 47, 239.

Mr. Passmore's efforts are specially directed towards very simple or uninstructed people, and those who have to teach the young and the unlearned. He deals as clearly as possible with popular objections, and touches upon the chief topics which are involved in the question, 'Where shall I go when I die, and by what faith and conduct here can I determine my eternal destiny?' He confines himself for the most part to the examination of Scriptural evidence and to a plain statement upon it, and his little book seems to us likely to give both comfort to mourners and sound instruction to general readers. The names used in the Bible for 'the place after death' are first enumerated and discussed, and we are reminded that God's work is still going on in the holy souls of the departed. In his useful chapter on Prayer for the dead we are sorry that Mr. Passmore did not print in full the 'suffrage' which Mr. Keble included in the twenty-sixth of his *Letters of Spiritual Counsel* (p. 46). In this chapter Mr. Passmore speaks of seducing 'evil spirits who play the part of persons who are dead,' and says, 'though many spiritualists are mere tricksters, I know from personal experience that spiritualism is capable of being a supernatural reality, and a very sad and horrible one' (pp. 32-3). The nature of the Resurrection and the Resurrection body is explained so far as the Bible affords evidence on these points. In the chapter on the end of the world Mr. Passmore takes the view that the passages on Antichrist in the New Testament have no reference to the Popes. The concluding chapters of the book are upon the Judgment, Heaven, and Hell—the justice of a judgment pronounced by Infinite Compassion, the nature and occupation of heaven, the solemn warnings of Holy Scripture on the subject of eternal hell.¹

The Christian Conception of Holiness. By the Rev. E. H. ASKWITH, M.A., Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1900.)

THE porch of this essay is so large as to be out of proportion to the rest of the structure, but it will win the attention of students of moral philosophy and show them that Mr. Askwith is a careful writer. His main thought is that holiness is perfect love, and in working up to this and examining its relation to Christian theology Mr. Askwith hopes that his essay may 'serve to restore the faith to some who, amid the unrest of the time and the unsettlement of old opinions, have felt the need of a re-statement of the eternal Gospel of Christ in the language of modern thought' (preface). The author describes his own purpose as an attempt to set forth the Christian teaching about God, and of man's relation to Him, with a practical object. He begins with the elementary notions of ethics contained in the four words Duty, Virtue, Right, and Good, and then proceeds to the relation of conscience to reason, and the place which happiness occupies in the schemes of utilitarianism. The drift of these earlier chapters points to 'the need for the introduction of the notion of

¹ There was an article on 'things beyond the tomb' in the *Spectator* of September 15 last.

holiness into ethical or moral philosophy.' In the sixth chapter, entitled 'The Old Testament Notion of Holiness,' we begin to reach the proper subject of the essay. Largely under the guidance of the teaching which is represented by Professor Robertson Smith, Mr. Askwith traces the process by which the idea of holiness was separated in the Old Testament from the limitations of other Semitic religions, and was continuously developed and purified, until it conveyed to man not only the original idea of the mutual relationship of God and man, but the eternal truth that God Himself is holy in His essential character. We consider that Mr. Askwith does not sufficiently recognize the clearness with which holiness as a moral attribute of God is revealed in the Old Testament. The further development of the idea is next traced in the early stages of our Lord's general teaching about the kingdom of God and the Fatherhood of God; and then we reach the central thought which 'has transfigured everything' for Mr. Askwith, but which, we must confess, does not strike us, who have read St. John's epistles, as being new. It is that God is a Being whose every thought is love, and that Creation is one great unselfish thought: namely, the bringing into being of creatures who can know the happiness which God Himself knows. We are not satisfied that the two statements that 'God is Love' and 'God is Holy' are identical in meaning, and we do not see that there was any necessary reason why Mr. Askwith should have imposed upon his argument the additional burden of the Scotist theory of the relation of the Incarnation to the Fall. But taking the thought of the central chapter as Mr. Askwith presents it to us, we can frankly say that we have been interested in the way in which he has traced its relation to St. Paul's teaching about the flesh and the Spirit, Justification and Sanctification, and to the general New Testament teaching about the relation of the human will to the purpose of God. We are far from satisfied with Mr. Askwith's treatment of 'The Fall and the Atonement.' He does not regard the story of the Fall as literally true, though he attaches great importance to its spiritual significance (p. 219), after his theory of evolution has obliged him to take Eden as a goal instead of a starting-point, and the whole story as 'ideal.' We confess that we make very little of this, and in the paragraphs on the Atonement we find Mr. Askwith taking that inadequate view of the objective barrier of sin which leads him to say that the Atonement 'is the reconciliation of man to God, not, properly speaking, of God to man' (p. 226). Old Testament criticism is regarded as teaching us the great truth of evolution, slow development and patient progress (p. 235). Finally, the Church is described as a divinely founded society in which Christian men have fellowship with one another and with God.

The Holy Spirit and Christian Service. By the Rev. J. D. ROBERTSON, M.A., D.Sc. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1900.)

THE substance of the lectures in this volume formed the teaching which Dr. Robertson gave in Edinburgh to the students of the United Presbyterian Christian Workers' Training Institute. There was great

variety in the attainments of his hearers. Some of them had received University training, and there were representatives of Home Mission workers, Biblewomen, district visitors, and tract distributors. The subject of the course was chosen solely with a view to the probable wants of such Christian workers as these, and the title is explained by the obvious remark that it is impossible to separate the work of the Holy Spirit from any 'service' that deserves the name of Christian. Dr. Robertson so sincerely desired to make his lectures useful to all his hearers that they are rather too general in their treatment of subjects, and might even be not unfairly called vague. We believe also that the lecturer has failed to convey an accurate impression of the great work of the Holy Spirit in 'quickening' the means which are used in the dispensation of the Incarnation for the high spiritual purposes of the kingdom of God. It is quite true that God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth; but that principle does not exclude the fact that the Son of God was made flesh, and that we receive of His fulness as the members of His body. The great principle of the Incarnation must be the basis of all true teaching about the work of the Holy Spirit and the operations of Divine Grace, and we do not feel assured that Dr. Robertson's hearers would at all clearly perceive that that principle was the groundwork upon which his structure was raised. While we cannot but regard the lectures as defective on this account, we desire to give a cordial welcome to Dr. Robertson's efforts to describe the wide extent of Christian service. This service is considered first in its ministration to all the varieties of the needs of the body, mind, moral nature, spiritual life, and social nature of man. Under these heads are brought hospitals, sanitary work, educational and remedial enterprises, literary and scientific pursuits, temperance and chastity, the work of converting, sanctifying, comforting, edifying, correcting, and developing man, and schemes of civil, political, and industrial activity. Again, Christian service is considered in relation to the needs of people of all ages—children, youths, adults, and the aged; and here Dr. Robertson mentions Sunday schools and orphanages, Scripture classes, clubs, guilds, societies, labour bureaux, prison-gate missions, agricultural settlements, assisted emigration, poor relief, almshouses and homes, and efforts to brighten life within existing institutions. Lastly, in connexion with the needs of people of all places—in home-lands, in Europe, in the colonies, and in heathen countries—are mentioned missions to the lapsed masses, the 'evangelization' of 'unreformed church populations' (a subject on which we should probably find ourselves unable to co-operate with Dr. Robertson), the application of Christian ideas to international relations, planting churches and schools among emigrants, and foreign missions of all kinds. These subjects are merely enumerated (p. 85), and are not discussed in detail. We have doubts whether many of Dr. Robertson's hearers and readers will be able to bridge over the distance which separates these very practical subjects from the generalities of the addresses. The true idea of the Christian life; the work of the Holy Spirit in Christian service; His distribu-

tion of gifts; the programme of work; preparation for it; the mission, method, power, and purpose of the Holy Spirit; our helps, hindrances, and rewards; and the relation between spiritual life and Christian service, are the broad titles of Dr. Robertson's addresses. And in order to bring them into touch with the special works of mercy in his list it would be necessary, we believe, to make much more frequent applications of general principles to practical cases than are to be found in this book. What Dr. Robertson wanted is a combination between Bishop Moberly's work on the *Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ* and Canon Keymer's *Workers with God*. But it is not often given to one man to combine such a grasp of deep principles with such a practical knowledge of pastoral work, and the really great parochial clergymen in whom this rare combination is found have no time to write books.

The Church of Scotland. First Church Congress held by order of the General Assembly, Glasgow, October 25 to 27, 1899. Official Report of the Proceedings. (Edinburgh: J. G. Hitt, 1899.)

THE object of this Congress was 'to bring together members of the Church of Scotland for free deliberation, and for the exchange of opinion and experience on subjects which affect the practical efficiency of the Church and the means of her defence and extension; also for the encouragement of a general interest in these and kindred subjects among the clergy and laity in different parts of the country.' If we bear in mind that in the early years of such gatherings as these it is the more ardent spirits who give the dominant tone to the discussions, we shall be able to form some idea from this Report of the present condition and tendencies of Presbyterianism in Scotland. It is a subject which is of much interest both by reason of the prospects of reunion between the two bodies of Presbyterianism, and the existence of what we may call a Tractarianizing movement among an earnest section of Presbyterians to which we called our readers' attention a few years ago.¹ After a reception by the Lord Provost and Magistrates of Glasgow in the municipal buildings, a sermon was preached to the Congress at a service held in Glasgow Cathedral by the Right Reverend the Moderator. A general meeting was then held, followed by three meetings for discussion, and a public meeting to which working men were specially invited.

The Moderator's sermon, on the text 'Righteousness exalteth a nation,' contained a confession that, while Glasgow had been a centre of religious life for thirteen hundred years, and the foundation of the Cathedral had been laid some seven hundred years ago, the Presbyterian form of government had only been, as he said, 'restored' two

¹ *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. lxxxiv., 'The Present Tendencies of Presbyterianism.' Since that article was written, official Presbyterianism has shown how a minister is properly repressed who attempts to present 'the Saviour in the Newer Light,' and has thereby offered a wholesome contrast to the Bishop of Worcester's behaviour in the matter of Mr. Beeby.

hundred and sixty-one years ago. We hope that Dr. Donald Macleod had these interesting figures in his mind when he advised his brethren in one of the later discussions to see that whatever they developed was on their 'own Scotch root' (p. 129). Principal Story, in the opening address of the Congress in St. Andrew's Halls, also makes some allusion to the ancient past in connexion with St. Kentigern, though to be sure he has recently destroyed our respect for his historical perception by his distortion of facts, and the bitter spirit of his arguments in the *Times* on the subject of places of Christian worship in India. In this address he speaks of the 'clusters of incomprehensibilities' in the *Quicunque vult*, which he calls 'upon the whole, perhaps, the most profane formula ever pronounced by a presumptuous dogmatism' (p. 19). It is hardly worth while to ask him whether he knows anything about the *Thalia* of Arius, for of course such wild talk is not to be taken seriously. The first subject chosen for discussion, and introduced by papers and selected speakers, was the Vocation of the Church and its relation to modern thought. Various descriptions of the Church and her Vocation were given by different speakers, and the attitude of successive speakers towards modern thought was by no means uniform. Dr. Leishman referred to the passage on the Kirk of God with which the second *Book of Discipline* opens, in justification of the threefold conception of the Church as consisting of those both godly and hypocrites who profess always outwardly the true religion, or secondly the godly and elect only, or thirdly for them that exercise spiritual functions among the congregations. Professor Paterson tersely took 'vocation' to mean 'end,' argued against Canon Gore's development of the idea of the Church as perpetuating the prophetic, priestly, and kingly mission of her Master, and describes His work as consisting to a large extent in the revelation and illustration of truth, but yet said that its central feature was spiritual ministry, and that this spiritual mission was set forth in works of mercy. Mr. J. R. Wilson regarded the Church as the Body of Christ, and said that her vocation was to declare the truth as it had been committed to her, to manifest life, and to redeem the world. Professor Herkless urged the importance of promoting the efficiency of ministers. Principal Stewart opened the subject of modern thought in a general paper, cautiously inclined to recognize its elements of good as much as possible. Mr. Millar's vigorous attack on the mutual contradictions of many higher critics seems to have been too flippant in the opinion of some subsequent speakers. The Lord Provost presided over the working men's meeting, when the attitude of the Church to social and economic movements was considered in a thoughtful paper by Professor Flint, on the broad lines that nothing that advances the Kingdom of God should be outside the sympathy of the Church. Dr. Glasle followed with a paper on 'Some Elements of Socialism,' and Mr. J. M. Robertson dealt more particularly with the specific relations of the Church of Scotland to these subjects.

The services of the Church and their adaptation to the necessities of the present day was the next subject. Dr. Lang read a paper

on 'The Desiderata of Congregational Worship,' and spoke of the need of a deepened sense of the responsibility of every worshipper, of the fact that worship 'is not rendered for or merely to the congregation, but by it,' and should be the outcome of abundant spiritual life. Dr. Sprott spoke of the small number of Church services, and in particular of the fact that public Baptism is now all but unknown in two thirds of the country parishes; the Holy Communion is celebrated in 102 parishes only once in the year, in 579 twice, in forty-two thrice, in sixty-four four times, and in three five times. In the course of the discussion it transpired that there were congregations in which it was felt that it was not for the welfare of the worshippers to join audibly in the Lord's Prayer. Another speaker had somewhere heard a hymn sung to the tune of 'Not for Joe,' and another feared that repetition of the Lord's Prayer or some stereotyped prayer belonged to the practices of a movement which had nothing to do with Presbyterianism at all. Members of the Church of England who have never taken part in any act of public worship from which the Lord's Prayer was omitted are probably not aware of the very different value set upon the Prayer in other religious societies.¹

The last subject was the 'Home Sphere of Church Work; the Obligation of the Church to its Parishes and to the Young.' Dr. Norman Macleod pleaded for a deeper sense of personal responsibility on the part of Church members, and Professor Menzies read a paper on 'Our Lord's Galilean Ministry,' as a national appeal, addressed among others to publicans and sinners, free from unnecessary difficulties and fearless. This, in fact, was a plea for parish work in the spirit of Christ; and Dr. Cumming followed upon the 'Marks of St. Paul's Work.' Professor Cowan urged the Supreme Court to come into closer touch with all parishes, and pleaded for adequate religious parochial provision, periodical efforts for foreign missions, and effective pastors. He added remarks on inadequate stipends, too stringent insistence on doctrinal conformity, and loss of energy by lamentable divisions. The papers on the Church's obligation to the young dealt with their religious education in England and on the Continent, and on the use of the Old Testament. On the first subject Mr. Crawford makes some instructive comparisons on elementary, secondary, and Sunday schools, and on the second subject Dr. Robertson confines himself chiefly to the great value of the moral teaching of the Old Testament. We can commend this volume to those who are interested in Scotch Presbyterianism as containing, in the closing words of the Moderator, papers and addresses of 'great ability and high tone' on many important subjects.

¹ The present writer recently attended a Methodist funeral as a mourner, and, while walking away afterwards with the minister, took occasion to observe that he was surprised at the omission of the Lord's Prayer at the graveside. The minister's reply was, 'We do not always use the Lord's Prayer unless the funeral is very elaborate!'

Notes on the Twenty-second Article. By the Rev. E. T. JESSE, M.A.
(London : Skeffington, 1900.)

MR. JESSE regards himself as 'a compiler, a purveyor of other men's wares, a mere retailer of home and foreign mental produce;' and his book mainly consists of quotations relating to facts and documents and expressions of the ideas of others. 'Verify your quotations' is regarded as an excellent counsel of perfection, not attainable in all cases; but still Mr. Jesse's compilation will be found to be of considerable service to students of the thorny subjects of this article: Prayers for the Departed, Purgatory, Pardons or Indulgences, Invocation of Saints, Images and Relics. After an introductory list of 'excerpta' on doctrine in general, the Anglican position, and the Articles in particular, Mr. Jesse inserts some quotations on the object and position of the Thirty-nine Articles in the English Church, illustrated by a lengthy extract from an article of ours on 'The Dogmatic Position of the Church of England' (No. 12). We are glad that Mr. Jesse recognizes that our *Review* always repays 'the reader desirous of solid information,' and refers to an article which so well expresses, now as then, our doctrinal position. In illustration of prayers for the departed passages are collected from early Liturgies, the Fathers, writers of the Reformation period and of our own times, filling some seventy pages and of various value. Similar copious illustrations are collected on the other subjects of the article. We do not know of any other volume which treats of this article alone, nor of any work where so much illustrative matter upon it will be found. We can therefore, on these grounds, commend it to the notice of our readers. But we must add that the pieces of evidence accumulated are of very different orders of merit, that the reader must sift the results of Mr. Jesse's industry for himself, and that he will do well to look at the two pages of *corrigenda* as he proceeds. The general impression which is produced upon our mind by an examination of these passages can be very briefly stated. They show that prayers for the departed are a part of our Catholic heritage which in no way involves us in the horrors of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, that the energy of the English Reformation shook off thoroughly undesirable incrustations of practice and morals in the matter of indulgences and relics, and that we have cause to be ever grateful to the Book of Common Prayer because it has trained up English Churchmen in the most wholesome habit of addressing prayer—as our Lord's pattern has taught us—to God alone. Into the details of Mr. Jesse's collection it is not necessary now to enter.

The Monthly Review, October, 1900. (London: John Murray.)

CERTAINLY the name of John Murray is a good name to conjure with, and if the future numbers of the *Monthly Review* are up to sample this new claimant to popular favour need fear no rival. 'None but itself can be its parallel.' The editor is Mr. Henry Newbolt, and if the editorial articles—entitled respectively 'The Paradox of Imperialism,' 'After Pekin,' 'Parties and Principles'—may be

assumed to proceed from his pen we can only say that as a publicist he exhibits capacities of the very highest order. 'The Imperialism of the later European monarchies was begotten of the idea of an Emperor. . . . The Imperialism of the British Commonwealth springs from the idea of an empire, and does not connote any particular government at all' (p. 9). In those few words the writer shows the hollowness of the outcry made at the recent elections against Imperialism. Then, again, how true is the remark, how pregnant with meaning, 'The Conservative is still accurately described by his name, but what has changed is the character of that which he wishes to conserve.' And the three essays abound with similar clear cut thoughts and forcible expressions. The contents of the *Monthly Review* have been advertised so far and wide that it would be superfluous to enumerate them in detail : Fiction, Art, the Stage, Eclipses, Surgery, and last, not least, a glimpse into the Autobiography of the Amir of Afghanistan, shortly to be issued by Mr. Murray—such is the varied *menu* set before us in this most attractive volume, which lacks nothing to fascinate the eye or to please the fancy or to engage the mind. The only subject omitted is the Church and Theology. No doubt the editor and publisher felt these subjects were more than adequately represented in the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review* !
